

Imprimatur,

HEN. ALDRICH,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

June 20.?
1694. *S*

Imprimatur,

HEN. ALDRICH,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

June 20.?
1694. }

A
D E F E N S E

OF THE

Christian Sabbath.

CONCERNING

PART the SECOND.
BEING
A REJOINDER to Mr. *Bampfild's* REPLY

TO

Doctor *WALLIS's* DISCOURSE

Concerning The

CHRISTIAN-SABBATH.

BY

JOHN WALLIS, D.D. And Professor of Geometry
in the University of OXFORD.

OXFORD,

Printed by *L. Lichfield*, for *Thomas Bennet*, at the *Half-Moon*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, LONDON. 1694.

DEFEAT

Christian Sabbath

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE First Edition, of the First Part, being Dispersed, and Scarce to be had; Care was taken to Re-print it, in the Second Edition, (with very little Alteration) Page for Page, so as not to Disorder the Citations.

Doctor WALLIS'S DISCOURSE
Concerning The
CHRISTIAN SABBATH

BY
JOHN WALLIS, D.D. A. B. D. of Oxon.
in the University of OXFORD.
OXFORD.
Printed by J. Legg, for Thomas Bland, at the Swan, in St. Pauls Church-Yard. A. M. D. C. C. C. C.

Part II. [1]

A DISCOURSE

Concerning The
Christian Sabbath.

PART the SECOND.

BEING

A Rejoinder to Mr. BAMPFIELD's Reply.

SIR,

WHEN I answered your former Book, which you call *An Enquiry*, &c. I did not know who was the Author of it, (or that you had entertained that Opinion,) and therefore could not pay you those Respects that otherwise I should have done. For though I had made Enquiry as I had opportunity at *Oxford*, of many there, (and particularly some of your good friends, and Non-Conformists, whom I thought most likely to know,) they all agreed that it was not Mr. *Bampfild* the Counsellor at Law, but some relation of yours. Nor was I rectified therein, till (a great while after my book was abroad) when I was informed by another good friend of yours (Mr. *P.F.*) that it was your Book. And I am not sorry (for some reasons) that I did not know it sooner.

However; it was not the Man, but the Doctrine, that I was to answer: And if, in so doing, I did not pay you those respects I would otherwise allow you; yet I hope there is nothing in it Undecent or Unbecoming a fair Disputant.

You observe (*Rep.* p. 1.) that I had said (in my *Discourse* p. 1.) That *I would not* (for my own part) *give any Disturbance* (on

(such account) to the Peace and *Præfice* of the Church where I live, so that a Sabbath be duly observed, though perhaps not upon what day I should choose: Which I find doth give you some disturbance, and it will take up some time to answer your Query's about it. I am of the same opinion still. For Reasons I then gave, p. 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, (To which you make no Reply.) Because I think the *Substantials* of a Duty, are of greater moment, and more intended in the Commands of God, than the *Circumstantials* that do attend it; and these upon occasion to give way to those.

I gave you many precedents to this purpose, p. 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, &c. *Circumcision* was, by the Institution, to be performed on the *Eighth day*: but in case it were then omitted, it might be done the next day, or some time after, rather than not at all. *Abraham* was 99 years old, and *Ismael* 13, and the other Males in *Abraham's* family of several ages when they were at once Circumcised, *Gen.* 17. 10, 23. And Proselytes were circumcised at any Age.

And Circumcision, (you know) was omitted in the Wilderness for forty years together (as inconvenient by reason of their uncertain travels) and those who were born during that time were at once Circumcised at *Gilgal*, *Josh.* 5. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. And *Timothy* was doubtless more than *eight days old*, when *Paul* caused him to be Circumcised, because his Mother was a Jew. *Act.* 16. 1. And all this notwithstanding your great Objection, No other day Commanded, no Promise to any other, nor Threatning for the omission.

The Passover was, by the Institution, to be kept on the fourteenth day of the first month; but *Hezekiah* (when it could not conveniently be done in the first Month) kept it in the second month, instead of the first (after it had been a long time intermitted,) *2 Chron.* 30. 2, 3.

The Jews had their Feasts of the New-Moons; but were at great uncertainties (as I there shewed, p. 11, 12.) as to one, two, or three days; and it was left much to the Priests discretion, which of those days should be reputed the day of the New-moon, yet was not the Service to be neglected; but to be performed, if not on the just day, at least on the reputed day of the New-moon. And no scruple (that I know of) was made upon it. Of which you may consult, if you please, Mr. *Selden's* Treatise *De Anno Civili Veterum Judeorum*. The Jews, I presume, have at this day *Kalendars* as other People have; and that some of their later Rabbins, since *Ptolemy's* time, have Tables of the Motions of the Sun and Moon borrowed from him; But we are here speak-

speaking of the times of *Moses*, and thence downward to Christ's time. And that they had then such Kalendars, I do not know, nor do believe. They had no doubt at that time a Solar Year (how exact, I know not,) according to which they judged of the Equinox, and of their Summer and Winter and Seed-time and Harvest: But their Feasts did depend on their Lunar Year, which was very uncertain; sometimes of Twelve sometime of Thirteen Months; and the beginnings of these Months very uncertain.

And the same uncertainty did affect the *Pass-over* also: For if the day of the *New-moon* were uncertain, it must be equally uncertain which should be the *fourteenth day* on which the *Pass-over* was to be kept. And we know *Christ* with his Disciples did eat his last *Pass-over* on One day, and the Jews on Another; which could not both be on the *fourteenth day* from the true New Moon; but were both so reputed, one by him, the other by them. And I do not find it blamed in either. I suppose you will not blame *Christ* and his Disciples. And I would not blame the other, because I find that God's Providence so ordered it that on this day *Christ* (the Antitype and true Paschal Lamb) was Crucified; not on the day when himself did eat the *Pass-over*. I would rather conclude from both, that the nicety of a Day was not then thought so considerable as to vitiate the Service.

And this of the Day might so happen as to make the *Month* uncertain also: For if the *Full-Moon* happened near the *Equinox*, it was much at the Priests discretion, whether it should be reputed the *thirteenth Month of the year Past*, or the *first Month of the year Coming*. To all which (and much more) you make no Reply at all.

And as to *Circumstances*, even in other *Institutions*, they may be part of the *Narrative*, when they are no parts of the *Institution*: As, in the Institution of the *Lords Supper*, that it was in an *Upper Room*, and *After Supper*, &c.

And, when in the first *Institution*, some Circumstantials were but *Occasional* (as to that Time and Place) they may cease to be *Obligatory*, when the case is altered: As, in the *Pass-over*, that it was to be eaten *standing*, with their *Loins Girt*, and *Staves in their Hands*, as in haste to be gone; and *not to stir out of the House till morning*, Exod. 12. 11, 22. Notwithstanding which, *Christ* with his Disciples (at his last *Pass-over*) did eat it *sitting* or rather *lying*, and went the same night to *Mount Olivet*, Mat. 26. 26, 30, 36.

For which considerations, with others of like nature, I think the difference of a day in many cases so inconsiderable, in com-
 A 2 pari-

parifon with the Subftantials of a Duty, as that I would not on this account give difturbance, though not upon [the day that I] fhould choofe.

But *What day I would choofe*, you fay, *you know not*. And you feem to *Hope*, Rep. p. 2. and *Think*, and *Judge*, and would have it thought, that *I would Choofe your feventh day Sabbath*: and this *after the beft judgment you can make of my book*, (for which reafon I fhall lefs truft to your Judgment another time,) and in-finuate (broadly enough) p. 62. as if I did *but efpoufe a notion* (againft my own judgment) *by which I have a benefit*, and, for fear to loofe or endanger that benefit, do imploy my learning and in-geny to caviil at you, and the direct will and word of God, and *Teach the contrary*; notwithstanding my doubts and fcruples; and p. 74. that I do it *for fome worldly advantage*: whereas you *Hope* and *Think* and *Judge* that (if left to my own choice) I am really of your mind. And you have the confidence Rep. p. 18. to de-fire that *the Doct̃or who is very able* would undertake your caufe: As if you thought me one of thofe who may be indifferently re-tained on either fide as there is occafion: (but, however, to be re-tained on both fides is not fair practice.) With many hard cenfures all along. (I believe that (till now) you had a better opinion of me. Have I loft all my reputation with you for not approving your Saturday-Sabbath?) I fhould not have expected that Mr. *Bampfild* would have thus infinuated without any ground, and take it to be more uncharitable than all the *hard Words* you com-plain of (p. 63.) from Mr. *Trofs*. (Which yet are moft of them your own.) I am fo charitable as to think Mr. *Bampfild* (though in an Error) doth argue according to his own judgment, not for *worldly advantages* contrary thereunto.

But, to put you out of *Doubt* (and answer your furmife) I will tell you, (without heftance, and *without doubt or fcruple*.)

I would choofe (if it were left to my choice) that Day which I think the Apoftles did obferve, and the Chriftian Churches in their time, (and ever fince,) which (in contradiftinction to the Jewifh Sabbath) they called *the Lords Day*; and *the firft day of the week*, or *the firft day after the* (Jewifh) *Sabbath*. And the middle part of this day, being the chief time for Action or Bufinefs (fuppofe from Sun-rifing to Sun-fetting,) I fhould take to be the middle-part of fuch Sabbath-day; taking into it, fo much Back-ward (toward the Mid-night laft paft) and fo much Forward (to-ward the Mid-night enfuing) as is wont to be accounted *time of bufinefs* (or the *dies practicus*,) and that fo much of the time (be-

tween

tween mid-night and mid-night) as is to be *time of business* should (on that day) be employed in *Religious business* (as, on other days, it is or may be employed in *Civil business*,) and so much of it (next after the mid-night past, and next before the mid-night following,) as is reasonably to be allowed for *Natural Rest*, should on this day be a Relaxation from *Religious business*, as on other days from *Civil business*. This is the Day I would choofe; and thus bounded.

But if I were in *New-England*, where (I am told) they use to begin their Sabbath on Saturday-night about Sun-set: I would then and there comply with the practice I there find, rather than give them any Offense or Disturbance therein. For I do not think it the design of the Fourth Commandment, to descend to such Pun&ilio's; but rather that the Sabbath-day should be so reckoned and so bounded, as other days are reputed to be.

But I have somewhat further to add to this purpose, upon consideration of the *Scheme* you give us, (*Repl.* p. 71, 72, 73.) for the accounting of Days.

You please to *begin or set forth* (as you say) at *Jerusalem*; (And why so, but because *you please*? Another perhaps would choose to begin at the *First Meridian*, or elsewhere. But, be it as you please.) From *Jerusalem* you begin your account on *Saturday Mar. 11. 1693*, and bring your account round the *Earth* to *Jerusalem* again. From hence Westward 15 degrees, will be *Saturday* still, but *an hour later* than at *Jerusalem*; and 15 degrees further, will be *two hours later* but still the same day; and so onward, for every *fifteen degrees*, allowing *an hour*. And accordingly at *Rome* (you tell us) it will be *Saturday* still, but *two hours later* than at *Jerusalem*. At *London*, *Saturday* will be 3 hours and 12 minutes later than at *Jerusalem*. At *Dublin*, about 3 hours and 32 minutes later than at *Jerusalem*. And passing on to *New-England*, (though in so passing you cross the first Meridian) it shall yet be *Saturday*, but later by *eight hours* than at *Jerusalem*. (Whether these be the just distances of those Meridians, is not material; but we will take them so to be.) Thence passing onward to *Japan*, it will there be *Saturday* still (or the *seventh day*) *March 11.* but later by 17 hours than at *Jerusalem*. And from *Japan*, You say (*to pass over the other Meridians and rest of the land in Asia*) about seven hours. (That is, in *China, India, Persia, Babylon, Syria, &c.* 'tis still *Saturday Mar. 11.* but later and later, till in 7 hours more we come from *Japan* to *Jerusalem* again.) And, because 17 and 7 are 24, when we come to *Jerusalem* again, we are then to call it *Sunday March 12*; but
till

till we come there, it must yet be *Saturday March 11*, though perhaps 23 hours (or more than so) later than at *Jerusalem*. And this, I think, you will not deny to be a just account of your Scheme, according to your own mind, *Rep.* p. 73. though in somewhat fewer words.

And according to this Scheme, at *Sinai*, *Jordan*, and *Mount Olivet*, (for we are not yet come to *Jerusalem*, all these places being Eastward from it,) it must yet be *Saturday March 11*. later by almost 24 hours than at *Jerusalem*. And particularly at *Mount Sinai* (which is, you tell us, 6 degrees Eastward from *Jerusalem*, that is, 24 minutes of time) it must yet be *Saturday, March 11*, but later than at *Jerusalem* by 23 hours and 36 minutes. At *Mount Olivet*, it must yet be *Mar. 11*. (for we are yet short of *Jerusalem*) but later by almost 24 hours (wanting less than one minute.) So that, if Christ did eat the Pass-over, on *Thursday* the Thirteenth day of the first month, and after went to *Mount Olivet*, it would there be but *Wednesday* the Twelfth day; and when he came back to *Jerusalem*, it was there again *Thursday* the Thirteenth, and if he had returned back again to *Mount Olivet* the same night, it would now again be but *Wednesday* the Twelfth.

But you may remember that you told us before (*Rep.* p. 67, 68, 69.) that though *the Sun* travel Westward, yet *the Posterity of Adam* and *Noah* did travel (not only Westward, but) *East, West, North* and *South*, over-spreading the Earth; and wherever they came (Eastward or Westward) after Six days of travel or other work, as the *Sun* did set, their Sabbath was to begin. (I will not trouble you with *Greenland*, where if they must wait till *Sun-set*, they must have no Sabbath for divers Months together.)

Now those who travel Eastward from *Jerusalem* must therefore reckon the same day, fifteen degrees Eastward, to be an hour sooner than at *Jerusalem*, and so in proportion the further they go; one hour for every fifteen degrees. And your self give us a precedent of such reckoning (p. 71.) at *Sinai* (being about six degrees of Longitude Eastward from *Jerusalem*) the seventh day at *Sinai* was about 24 Minutes sooner than at *Jerusalem*, yet was the Seventh day at both.

Let us now begin where you left, that is, at *Sunday Mar. 12. 1693* at *Jerusalem*. This at *Sinai* will be *Sunday* (the same day) but 24 minutes sooner than at *Jerusalem*, as you tell us, pag. 71; But, according to your other account, pag. 73. it was to be *Saturday* 23 hours and 36 minutes later than at *Jerusalem*. And whether of the two reckonings must we follow? And at *Japan*, 'twill be

be the same day (Sunday) but earlier by 7 hours than at *Jerusalem*. And at *New-England*, the same day (Sunday) will be sixteen hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*. And Sunday at *Rome* will be 22 hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*. And so onward till you come to *Jerusalem* again. But then (and not till then) instead of calling it Sunday Mar. 12. 24 hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*, we must call it Saturday Mar. 11. at *Jerusalem*: Which is a just account, according to your own Scheme, as to those who travel Eastward; or so reckon as if they did so travel.

So that, at *Japan*, (according to your two accounts) it is indifferent whether to call it Saturday 17 hours later, according to pag. 73. or Sunday 7 hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*, according to pag. 71. And at *New-England*, 'tis indifferent whether to call it Saturday eight hours later, or Sunday 16 hours sooner, than at *Jerusalem*: for 'tis just the same time either way.

But, notwithstanding this indifference, I would, as to *New-England*, comply with your Scheme pag. 73. and call it (as you do) Saturday eight hours later, (though in going thither we cross the first Meridian,) because in *New-England* they do so account their days. But, as to *Japan*, I would not comply with you, to call it Saturday seventeen hours later, but would choose to call it Sunday seven hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*; because, at *Japan*, they do so account their days. And therefore though I do acknowledge (as you speak *Repl. p.2.*) that the Word is the Rule of Worship; yet I would here be guided by the Practice of the place, (for the Word hath herein determined nothing either way) which practice therefore I would not disturb.

And this doth furnish a Third Expedient (beside the Two which I gave you before) by travelling to *Japan*. For what you call Saturday (or the Seventh day) seventeen hours later, will be the same with what they call Sunday (or the first day,) seven hours sooner than at *Jerusalem*. That is, Your Saturday-sabbath, will be the same with their Sunday-sabbath. Or if to *Japan* be too great a Journey, 'twill be the same case if you go but to *China*, *East-India*, *Persia*, *Babylon*, or but to *Syria*, or any place Eastward to *Jerusalem*.

But (in erecting this Scheme, and setting out from *Jerusalem* Westward, reckoning Mar. 11. till we come round to *Jerusalem* again) you do it, you say, without setting a Meridian; I suppose, by Meridian, you mean without setting a First Meridian (for otherwise every place hath its Meridian;) But in thus reckoning you do (though you be not aware of it) make this a first Meridian.

ridian. For, a *first Meridian* is that from whence we reckon 1, 2, 3, &c. till at 360 we come round thither again. For, so reckoning, makes this (to you) the *first Meridian*. Onely you reckon from thence 1, 2, 3, &c. *Westward*: whereas others do so reckon from their *First Meridian Eastward*. But in *pag. 71.* you so reckon *Eastward* as others do. Both which make it a *first Meridian*.

I have but one thing more here to note and I shall dismiss this point. And it is your prudent choice of the *Equinoctial day*, when the days and nights be equal all the World over. For if you had pitched upon any other day than one of the two *Equinoxes*, the *Obliquity of Horizons* (as you are well aware, *Rep. p. 70.*) would quite have spoiled your reckoning. For though, to all under the same Meridian, it be *Mid-day* at the same time, and *Mid-night* likewise; yet *sun-rising*, and *sun-setting* be at very different times, even to those under the same *Meridian*. And accordingly the Sabbath not to begin, at all times of the year, at *Rome, London, New-England, &c.* so long before or after that at *Jerusalem*, as your *scheme* appoints. But I shall press this no farther.

But thus much is undeniably evident from your own Scheme, that, at *Japan* for instance, or Mount *Sinai*, the same day may indifferently be called *saturday* or *sunday*, according as from *Jerusalem* you reckon *Westward* or *Eastward*. Which is enough for the purpose to which I allege it.

From what hath been said, I think it is very plain, That since, according to your own Scheme (any where but at *Jerusalem*;) the same day may be indifferently called *Sunday* or *Saturday* (the *first* or the *seventh* day) according as to that place we reckon from *Jerusalem* Eastward or Westward: I am still of opinion that we should not quarrel upon a circumstance which doth not influence (as you call it *Eng. pag. 27.*) the *lively, fiery, morning and evening Word and Prayer*: for men may be as *dead and formal* on a *Saturday* as on a *Sunday*.

You next fall upon me (*Rep. p. 2.*) to know *what Church*, it is I would not disturb; for *we live in an age* (you tell us) *wherein are variety of Churches*. Now this I take to be a captious Question. Would you have me here enter on a Dispute of *Whigg* and *Tory*; of *Conformist* and *Non-conformist*; *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Anabaptist*, *Jews* and *Quakers*? (Pray which Church or Churches of all these is it that you have a sight at, in contradistinction to the Churches of Christ, who's true peace, you say, you would not disturb?) No I shall not be lead aside from the point in hand

hand to any of these disputes, which are nothing to the present purpose. By *the Church* whose peace and practice I would not herein disturb, I mean *the Generality of Christian people amongst whom I live*. For (without disputing what other varieties there may be amongst us) I think we are all agreed, except your self and some few others (not so many, I hope, as to be called *the Church*;) to celebrate *the Lords-day*, not the *Jewish Sabbath*.

I would say the like as to your other excursions (in which you seem to take great pleasure) against *Christmasts, Easter, Whitsuntide*, (and other tides as you call them) *Holy-days, Rome, Purgatory, Mass and Monckery, Formal Worship, Forms of Worship, the Lords Prayer in Publick, Ceremonies, Tradition, Black Garments*, your thoughts of *Monarchy, Swearing to a point, Abjuring Endeavors*, and other the like excursions; with which I mean not to trouble my self: Because, whatever there be of Good or Bad in any of these, it is nothing to our present purpose of a *Saturday-sabbath*. You are very touchy with me (*Rep. p. 31, 32.*) for but naming the phrase of *Hold-ing-forth*, though (I think) very innocently. (And so, I suppose, will those think, that consult the place, not as you cite it *Rep. p. 32.* but as it is in my *Discourse*, p. 29.) This you call *Bleating*, and *Highly Blamable*. (Whether you take me for a *Sheep*, or a *Calf*, I cannot tell.) But, pray Sir, are the Words and Phrases of Non-Conformists, so sacred, that a man may not venture to *Name* one of them, without a Reprimand? While you take the liberty to be all-ways Flurting at the Words, Phrases, and Practices of others, when it is nothing to the Purpose. It may prove perhaps that you have a special Knack at Finding Fault, but proves nothing to the point in hand. You would not take it kindly of me, if I should upon all occasions (or without occasion) be still inveighing against *Schism, Separation, Non-conformity*, and *Judaizing* (with many other like Topics) or charge you (by insinuation) with *worshipping Saturn upon Saturday* as oft as you do us with worshipping the Sun upon Sunday: (But, to worship the Sun upon Sunday, runs so glib upon your tongue, that you must needs be at it again and again, even after I had shew'd you plainly that there is no Foundation for it.) Now if it would not become me (as I think it would not) to be still snarling as I go along, at what is nothing to the purpose; pray consider, whether you or I are most blamable in this regard. And, if I have handled you therein more softly than perhaps another disputant would have done; you should not blame me for it; but rather take it kindly.

These things I mention in the beginning, that I may at once throw off these Extravagances and impertinent Excursions, and

not be concerned to answer them where-ever I meet them. And though you tell me, (*Rep. p. 55.*) *this is a short way of answering,* 'tis the way I think fit to use, as to what is nothing to the purpose. You tell us (*p. 75.*) you *pass by divers expressions in the Doctor's Book;* and so shall I in yours, when they be nothing to our business.

But let us come to the business in hand: Wherein are Two Points in question, very distinct: Though you please to make them but One.

First, Whether we have sufficient ground for celebrating the *Lord's-day*, or *First Day of the Week*, as the weeks were then accounted by the Jews, or be now by us.

Secondly, Whether we are also obliged to keep the *Jewish Sabbath* on their *Seventh day*.

The first of these I think was not at all questioned in the Apostles time, but practised generally by all Christians: For it being admitted that the Apostles had Authority and Direction from Christ, for ordering the affairs of the Christian Church, they had no more reason to except against this, than against the introducing of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the institution of Elders, Deacons, Bishops, and of whatever other Officers and Orders in the Church. And therefore of this we meet with no disputes, but a silent Practise. Whether you will allow it the name of *Sabbath* or not, is but to dispute about Words. If you do not like that Name, I allow you to call it *the Lord's Day* as they did. I take it to be a *Sabbath* within the prospect of the *Fourth Commandment*; though, for distinction sake from that of the Jews, they gave it another Name. And I find you sometimes to give the name of *Sabbath* to days which I do not find so called in Scripture.

About the Other, the case was much the same as that of Circumcision, the Pass-over, and other Jewish Feasts or Festivals, the Abstinence from Meats, their Rites of Purification, and the like, which had once been Laws. Of which those who were *Zealous of the Law* were very fond, and loth to part with them. And those of them who thought themselves obliged to be *Baptized and Circumcised also*; did no doubt think themselves obliged, beside the Christians *Lord's-day*, to observe also the *Jewish Sabbath*. This I take to be the true State of the Question then; and this is that which you would now revive.

Concerning the latter, the Apostle adviseth a mutual Forbearance, allowing each to practise according to their own sentiments, without censuring of others, till with time and leisure they should be better satisfied of their Christian Liberty: And did himself comply with them therein; as things *Tolerable*, though not *Oblig-*

ging.

ging. With the *Jews*, I mean; to whom these had once been Laws; but would not have them introduced on the *Gentiles* (as a new Yoke) to whom they had not been Laws before. Of which great distinction I do not find that you take any notice, though I had minded you of it, *Disc.* p. 52, 53, 54, and elsewhere. And we find great weight laid upon this distinction, *Act.* 21. 19, 20, 21. Where *James and the Elders at Jerusalem* do advise *Paul*, though the *Apostle of the Gentiles*, yet (because he was a *Jew*) so far to comply with the *Jews* as to own the lawfulness of their practising, what they did not think fit for the *Gentiles* to do; clearly distinguishing between the *Gentiles*, and the *Jews among the Gentiles*. *Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are which believe*, but yet are all *Zealous of the Law*; And they are informed of thee that thou teachest all the *Jews* that are among the *Gentiles* to forsake *Moses*, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their Children, neither to walk after the Customs, ver. 20, 21. Which was true as to the *Gentiles*, but not as to the *Jews among the Gentiles*. For taking off which prejudice, they advise him to take to him four men who had a Vow, and purify himself with them; to satisfy the *Jews* that he had been misrepresented, and that himself (a *Jew*) walked orderly and kept the Law, ver. 23, 24. But, as touching the *Gentiles which believe*, we have written (say they) and concluded, that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to Idols, and from blood, and from strangling, and from fornication, ver. 25. But nothing of the *Jewish Sabbath* (in contradistinction to the *Lord's Day*;) Which I take to be particularly intended by the word *Sabbath*, *Col.* 2. 16.

Of these Two Questions I shall speak distinctly; and first, *That we have sufficient ground for Celebrating the Lord's Day.*

To this, your great Objection is, that there is no *Express Command Recorded in Scripture*, for so doing.

In Answer to this I shew'd first, that an *Express Command Recorded*, is not necessary for our Warrant: And then, that there is otherwise in the Word of God sufficient to warrant us therein.

In order to the first, I gave you divers Instances (*Disc.* p. 16, 17.) to which I do not remember that you give any Answer. God was worshiped by *Sacrifices* very early; at least as early as that of *Cain* and *Abel*: And though (I suppose) you think they had some Command for it, yet we have no such *Command Recorded*, antecedent thereunto. The like of *Jacob's* consecrating a Pillar, by pouring Oyl upon it, without any antecedent *Command Recorded* for consecrating either Things or Persons by Anointing, or pouring on of Oyl.

There was (I presume) a Command (or somewhat equivalent thereunto) that *Fire for Incense* should be taken from the *Altar* (else *Nadab* and *Abihu* would not have been destroyed for offering strange fire.) But I do not find such *Express Command Recorded*. (With other the like Instances, which I forbear to repeat.) To which let me now add the distinction of *Clean and Unclean Beasts and Fowls before the Flood*. *Gen. 7. 2. Gen. 8. 20.* Which was then observed, and by God approved, (as appears by his sending Those by *Seven's*, and These by *Two's*.) and we have reason to think, it was by his order. Yet is no antecedent *Command Recorded* for such distinction that I find. And accordingly I do not doubt but that the Apostles had sufficient authority and direction from Christ (who gave them *Commandments, of things pertaining to the kingdom of God, Act. 1. 2, 3.*) for what they settled in the Christian Church, though the particular *Commands* be not *Recorded*. I do not find any particular *Commands* from Christ for their appointing the *seven Deacons*. *Act. 6.* for their ordaining *Elders in every Church*. *Act. 14. 23.* for giving the like in charge to *Timothy*, to ordain *Bishops and Deacons at Ephesus*, *1 Tim. 3.* and the like to *Titus in Crete*, to ordain *Elders in every City*. *Tit. 1.* But because they did these things, we presume they had sufficient warrant, though we have no *express Command recorded* for their so doing.

I add further: You suppose (I presume) that there is a *sufficient Warrant* for a *Weekly Sabbath* from *Gen. 2. 2, 3.* yet there is no *express Command* for it. 'Tis said that *God Rested* (that is, he ceased to create,) but 'tis not said that *Man rested*, or that he was *Bid to rest*. 'Tis said *God blessed the Seventh-day and sanctified it*. (What these words may imply, I need not here dispute.) But 'tis not said that *Man did sanctify or keep it holy*, or was *bid so to do*. *God rested the seventh day*; but he did no more repeat the *seventh day of Rest*, than the *six days of Creation*. And if *Man* did sanctify or keep holy that *one day*, it is not said that he *did* or was *bid* to keep holy every *seventh day* to the *Worlds end*; and that it must be just *that seventh day* (in a continued circulation of *Weeks* from the *Creation*) and *no other*; and that he must begin every such day *just at the same time of the day* as *God did his Seventh day*; or just at the same time of the day as it was in *Paradise* (at that moment when *God* ceased to work) though at the same moment it were all hours of the day in some place or other. And if you would have us think (because you think so) that *all this* is there implied; yet certainly this is much short of an *express Command recorded*, for *All this*. I say for *All this*. For such were my words *Disc. p. 4.* It is not
ex.

expressly said, that All mankind must, for ever after, observe Every Seventh-day in Every Week of Days, reckoned continually from the first Creation, which, when you cite part of my words Repl. p. 6. you thought fit to omit. Yet All this must be shewed to be expressly commanded (according to your notion) or else somewhat less than an express Command Recorded, may serve to justify our Practice, and intimate God's Pleasure. Less therefore than an Express Command Recorded may serve to Intimate God's Pleasure, and Warrant our Practise as to the Lord's Day.

In the next place, let us see what may be alleged in the present case, to warrant our celebration of the *Lord's-day*.

That the *Resurrection* of Christ, which doth accomplish the work of our Redemption (as *Rom. 8. 34. Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again; Who died for our sins and rose again for our justification, Rom. 4. 25.*) is a mercy doubtless that is worth remembering, and therefore not improper for a solemn Commemoration, if at least we have any *incouragement* from *Christs* or the *Apostles practise* for so doing; since great part of the Christian Institution is founded on the *Apostles practise*, and that of the *Primitive Church*.

We find that Christ himself, on the day of his *Resurrection*, the *First day of the Week*, or the *first day after the (Jews) Sabbath*; did first appear to the good *Women* who sought him at the Sepulcher, declaring to them the *Resurrection* (which was to *preach* to them a new Doctrine of which before they were not aware,) and *bid them* tell it to the *Disciples*; which they did, and thereupon *Peter* and *John* (from the rest) went to the Sepulcher and found it so: Which no doubt put them upon serious thoughts, waiting what the issue of this might be. He then joins in company with *two Disciples* going to *Emmaus*, (whether two of the Twelve, we know not; nor is it very material,) finds them *engaged in Religious discourse*; And *preaches* to them (from *Moses* and the *Prophets*) the things concerning himself; *stays with them at Emmaus*, continuing the same discourse, and was known to them by *breaking of bread* (celebrating the *Lords Supper*;) all which are *Religious employments*, proper for the *Celebration of such a day*. He then comes to the *Disciples at Jerusalem*, preaches to them the same Doctrine, gives them his *Blessing* (a first and a second time;) blames their *unbelief*, confirms their *Faith*, renews the *promise* of sending the *Holy Ghost*; gives them *Commission* for *preaching the Gospel*, and *planting the Christian Church*; with power of *Miracles* for confirmation of their Doctrine: As I shewed at large (*Disc. p. 17, 18, 19, 20.*) from *Luk. 24. Job. 20. Mar. 16.* All which put together looks very like the *Celebrations*.

bration (if not the Consecration) of a *Christian Sabbath*, or *Day of Religious Worship*. 'Tis all *Sabbatical work*, and a great deal of it. And we have reason to think (though it be not expressly said so) that he then gave them order to continue the like for the future.

This matter of fact you cannot deny; but do expressly grant it, *Rep. p. 19, 20, 21.* and that all this was *Religious Employment*, fit exercise for such an occasion. Your little Exceptions were most of them answered before. But because you repeat them, I must repeat the Answers. You say, From *Jerusalem to Emmaus* and back again, was more than a *Sabbath days journey*, yet Christ doth not reprove the two Disciples for so traveling. True, (at least so far as we know.) Nor was there any reason for it. For they did not know when they began their journey, what Christ might do before the day was over. I might tell you also (as here you speak) That he did not reprove them, *is not written*. You say, That Christ did travel without pain, *is not written*. True. Nor is it material to me whether he did or did not. (I do rather think, that, after his Resurrection, he was not subject to Bodily Weariness.) But he was Preaching all the while (and then, whether sitting or walking is much one.) I hope you do not think it a breach of the Sabbath for a man to take pains in Preaching. You say, The Disciples being assembled at Jerusalem was *Providential*. True. The Providence of God so ordered it that they should be there assembled: But doth it thence follow that they were not religiously employed? You say, You do not know (because it is not written) what they were then employed about, unless mourning and weeping *Mar. 16. 70.* Do you know how Adam was employed (all the day) on the Seventh day from the Creation? That is no more written than this: You own they were employed in mourning and weeping. Very well: and was not mourning and weeping, at that time, a seasonable employment? You do not know but that, with their mourning and weeping, they might add Prayer also and religious Discourse, and serious Consultation what they were to do in these circumstances, and waiting on God for direction therein. Sure I am, you do not know (nor is it written) that they were employed about any servile work. Part of the time they were (we know) *Religiously employed*, and you do not know but that they were so all the day. You would have it supposed *Rep. p. 33.* that Paul's preaching in the Synagogue did comprehend his conscientious observing the whole Sabbath day (though it be not written) and why may we not as well suppose, the disciples here were well employed all the day? But you say Christ appeared to the Eleven as they sate at Meat; it was as they sate at Meat. Very well. But do you think they might

not

not *Eat* on a Sabbath-day? Was it a breach of the Sabbath to *Eat*? Christ's saying to them *Peace be unto you* was (you tell us) an ordinary salutation, frequent in scripture. But, when Christ said it, was it not a *Blessing* also? When *Man* says, *Peace be unto you*, it is a *Prayer*; but when *God* says it, 'tis more than so, it is an *Authoritative Benediction*. And when he said it again a second time, (*Jesus* said to them again, *Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you: And when he had said this, he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted &c. Job. 20. 21, 22, 23.*) was all this but an *Ordinary Salutation*? But suppose the Disciples (not yet knowing, before Christ came to them, that he would appoint the day to be so observed) had on some part of the day done some ordinary business that we know not of, was this any fault in them? Or doth it thence follow that it was not for the future (when they should know it) to be religiously observed? Doth any thing appear, after Christ came to them, but what was highly Religious? But, that this doth alter the Seventh or appoint the First day for a Sabbath (you say) you do not find. Stay a while, we are not yet upon that point, *What is to become of the Seventh day*, or whether the First is to be called a Sabbath. (We shall come to that anon.) We are yet inquiring Whether there be not from hence encouragement for a Religious Observation of this day. We do not read (you say) the Lord blamed the Disciples for resting on the Sabbath-day; (meaning, the Jews Sabbath then past.) Very True. Nor was there any occasion for it. For the Sabbath-day was past before the Resurrection: And 'tis not pretended that, before the Resurrection, (the Memorial thereof) the First day was appointed. But neither do we Read, that they did so Rest; you do but think so.

From what hath been said, we see that Our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Disciples with him, did celebrate the day of the Resurrection, by Religious Employments. Which is one good Precedent; and somewhat more than what you shew us of the Seventh day Sabbath from Gen. 2. 2, 3. That God did rest the Seventh day, we there Read, (or, as you please to phrase it, that our Lord Jesus Christ did so rest) but, that *Man* did so rest (or was bid so to do) we do not Read: You can but conjecture it (as you speak) or collect it by Argument.

We come now to a second Precedent. That God did once rest on the Seventh day, we read. But that he did repeat his Seventh-day Rest, we no more read, than that he repeated the six days of Creation. But our Lord Jesus Christ did a second time so meet with his Disciples so assembled, and was in a like manner employed. After

eight days Christ appeared to the Disciples, and Thomas with them. *Joh. 20. 26.* He then satisfied Thomas (who was before absent) as well as the rest concerning the Resurrection, and much in the same manner as before, but with somewhat more particular. That he did so meet, with the Disciples then assembled, you do not deny; nor, that they were so employed. But you do not admit that *after eight days* doth signify the eighth day after taken inclusively. (And why not? But because then it would be on the first day of the week as the other was?) And you are offended that I should take this to be a Cavil. *After eight days*, you say, may be the ninth or tenth day (yes, or the twentieth, or a year after, for all this is *after eight days*.) and you can so count it upon your fingers (*Enquiry*, p. 50, 51.) But you know also, that it is the usual way in Scripture (and other where) thus to reckon inclusively. I gave you several instances to that purpose, of which I shall repeat some. *Mat. 27. 63.* they tell *Pilate*, *This deceiver said, After three days I will rise again,* (*and* *non dubitans*) meaning thereby the third day after inclusively; and therefore they pray that the Sepulchre might be made sure till the third day. They should have said (according to your reckoning) on the fourth day and so forward; for to what purpose would it be to secure it till the third day and no more, if the Pretense of Rising were not till after the third day is past. Here, you confess (*Rep.* p. 23.) that, by *after three days* must needs be meant, till after the third day is come; not, till after the third day is past; and so his enemies understand it.

So *Mar. 8. 31.* *The Son of Man must be killed, and After three days rise again;* that is, on the third day inclusively. And here also you own (*Rep.* p. 23.) that it must be so understood; *The Crucifixion* (you say) was on the sixth day, and the Resurrection on the first day of the next week; and therefore, by *After three days*, is meant *After part of the sixth day, the whole Seventh day, and part of the First day.* You own therefore that in these places *after three days* must needs be the same as on the third day. And why not as well *after eight days* the same as on the eighth day.

After eight days, you say, is no where explained to be the Eighth day. What subtlety there may be in the words, is no where explained, I cannot tell: But doth it no where so signify? What say you to that *Luk. 2. 21.* *When Eight days were Accomplished* (for the Circumcision of the Child) *they called his name of Jesus?* 'tis all one to say *When eight days were accomplished* as to say *After eight days be come?* And this also you own (*Rep.* p. 24.) must be so understood. Now, If *after three days* signify no more but *after the third day was come*: why should we not think that *after eight days* doth as well sig-

signify *after the eighth day was come*; that is, as we use to speak in English, *on that day se'night*. Sure we are, it was not on the Jewish Sabbath (for it was, to that, but *Seven days*, not *after Eight days*.)

'Tis manifest therefore that our Saviour made choice of *another day* than the Jewish Sabbath, for these *Sabbatical Works*: And I think it is plain to be *the first day of the week*.

I'll give you one text more, (which I did not name before, because I would not trouble you to compute it,) *Act. 24. 1. After five days, Ananias the High-Priest descended with the Elders and with a certain Orator named Tertullus who informed the Governour against Paul. After five days*, that is, *on the fifth day* (after Paul's being apprehended.) How doth that appear, (you will ask) since it is *no where explained*, that this *after five days* is *on the fifth day*? I'll shew you presently. Paul comes to Jerusalem, *Act. 21. 17.* that was one day. *The day following* ('tis said) Paul went in with us unto James, and all the Elders were present, ver. 18. Who then advise him thus, *We have four men which have a Vow on them; take them and purify thy self with them, Sec. ver. 23, 24.* that's a Second day. Then Paul took the men and the next day (there's a Third day) purifying himself with them, entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of Purification, ver. 26. (which we find to be the space of seven days, *Num. 6. 1. 3.* inclusively from that Third day; which were therefore to end on the Ninth day.) But when the seven days were almost ended, ver. 27. not, when the last of those seven were almost ended (for we have not days enough for that) but, the seventh day was almost come (for when that day was come, the seven days were accomplished, according to that *Luk. 2. 21.*) that is, on the sixth day of those seven, which was the Eighth day from his coming to Jerusalem. On this Eighth day the Jews laid hands on him, ver. 27. and when they were about to kill him, the chief Captain rescued him and carried him into the Castle, ver. 31, 34. On the morrow (which was the Ninth day) he was brought down before the Council, Chap. 22. 30. where he made his defense, Chap. 23. and was brought back to the Castle, ver. 16. That night the Lord stood by him to comfort him, ver. 11. ('tis said that night, the night of that ninth day, not on the morrow night, as if it were the night of the tenth day.) and when it was day (that is on the Tenth day) more than forty of the Jews banded together to kill him, ver. 12, 13. of which conspiracy when Paul's kinsmen had informed the chief Captain, ver. 16, 20, 21. he sent him that night (the night of the tenth day,) with a guard, to Antipatris ver. 23, 31. from whence on the morrow (which was the Eleventh day) he came to Cesarea ver. 32, 33. (which Eleventh day

is the *morrow after*, the *third hour of the night* foregoing, not the *same day* with it.) When they came to *Cesarea*, *Pellis* commanded him to be kept in *Herod's Judgment-hall*, till his *Accusers* should come, ver. 35. (which was on the next day.) And after *five days*, Chap. 24. 11. (not, from the *Eleventh* on which he was brought to *Cesarea*, but from the *Eighth* on which he was seized in the Temple) the *High Priest* and *Elders*, with *Tertullus* a *Lawyer*, came down to inform against him. Now, if after *five days* be meant of the *fifth day* (from that *Eighth*) *inclusively* (taking that *Eighth day* for the first of the five) this will be on the *Twelfth day*; if on the *fifth day after* (exclusive of that *eighth day*) it will be on the *Thirteenth*; if after *five whole days* (beside that *eighth*) were past, it must be the *Fourteenth* from his first coming to *Jerusalem*. And which of the three it was, *Paul* tells us at ver. 11. *I know ye may understand* (saith he to the Governour) *that there are yet but Twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem for to worship*. So that after *five days* must be meant of the *fifth day current, inclusively*; otherwise it would have been *thirteen* or *fourteen* days from his coming to *Jerusalem* to worship. Now if *St. Luke*, by *when eight days were accomplished* do mean the *eighth day current* Luk. 2. 21. and the same *St. Luke* by *after five days* do mean the *fifth day current (inclusively)* Act. 24. 11. And *St. Matthew* (Chap. 27. 3.) and *St. Mark* (Chap. 8. 31.) by *after three days* do mean the *third day inclusively*, why should not *St. John* (Chap. 20. 26.) be thought to speak the same language, by *after eight days* meaning the *eighth day inclusively*. Especially, when there is no appearance of reason to the contrary, save that it doth not favour your *Fansy*.

And *Levit. 23. 15, 16.* *Ye shall count unto you, from the morrow after the Sabbath (from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering) seven Sabbaths shall be complete; even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days.* Which cannot be, unless the first and last day be taken into that number, *inclusively*. And if these (with what I said before) be not enough, you may find many more if you please to search.

A like reckoning we have, concerning *Cornelius*, Act. 10. *Cornelius* saw a *Vision* about the *Ninth hour of the day*, ver. 3. (that's one day.) When the *Vision* was ended, he presently sent *two servants* and a *souldier* for *Peter*, ver. 7, 8. as he was directed: On the *morrow* (that's a second day) *Peter* went up to pray about the *sixth hour*, and saw a *Vision* likewise, ver. 9. &c. Which being ended, the men who were sent from *Cornelius*, were (by that time) come, and enquired for him, ver. 17, 18. He went down to them, called them in, and lodged them that night, ver. 21, 23. On the *morrow* (that's a third

third day) he went with them from Joppa ver. 23. On the morrow after (that is a fourth day) they entered into Caesarea, where Cornelius waited for them; (ver. 24.) who tells him (ver. 30.) Four days ago I was fasting &c. (relating the cause why he sent for Peter.) Now if that (before this) was four days ago, this (after that) must be four days after; which was (as is manifest) the fourth day, inclusively.

You may see more to this purpose in my Discourse p. 20, 21, 22. which I do not repeat, because you seem to think (Rep. p. 22.) there is too much already.

You have never heard, you say, much less do we commonly so speak; that after eight days, is that day se'nights: I suppose you lay the Emphasis on *We*; that is, *We in England* do not commonly so speak. But, you know, in other languages (and, I think, in all other) they do so speak. I need not tell you that, What we call a *Se'nights*, a *Fortnight*, the French call *huit jours*, *quinze jours*, that is, *Eight days*, *Fifteen days*. Nor need I tell you that S. Luke did not speak *English*, nor did he live in *England*.

But, after all this fencing (I must not call it *shifting*) do you indeed think that after eight days (in this place) is not meant of the same day in the next week? And do you so think (as you phrase it) without doubt or scruple? You say (Rep. p. 22.) you do not discern but that it may be (the second or third day of the next week) but do you think *It is so*? Consider of it. And if what I say now be not enough, look over also what I said before.

And you do not produce any place where this form of Speech is otherwise to be understood. Only two places you mention, where you think possibly it may be. Which I shall consider. Mat. 26. 2. To know what after two days is the Passover, and the Son of Man is betrayed to be Crucified, seems to be want (you say Rep. p. 22.) after two days exclusively; that is, excluding the day on which that was said. If you think so, I cannot help it: Nor can you help it if I think otherwise. I take it to be thus; after two days, or there are but two days (no day and to morrow) when (at evening) I shall eat the Passover, and shall be betrayed to be crucified. And ver. 2. while (in the mean time) the chief Priests &c. were assembling, consulting how they might take Jesus by subtilty and kill him. (After which follows presently, ver. 6. Now when Jesus was in Bethany, (viz. the same day) there came a Woman (viz. Mary the Sister of Lazarus, Joh. 11. 2.) With an Alabaster Box of Ointment, and poured it on his head, ver. 7. Which when the disciples saw it, they (that is, one of them, meaning Judas Iscariot Joh. 12. 5.) said unto her thus, this ointment might have been sold and given to the poor &c. ver. 8, 9.

not that he cared for the poor, but because he had the bag. John. 12. 6.) To whom when Jesus had given an unpleasing answer, *The poor you have always with you, &c.* ver. 10, 11, 12, 13. then Judas went unto the high Priests, and agreed to betray him, ver. 14, 15, 16. Now the first day of unleavened bread (the latter of those two days) the disciples came unto Jesus saying, where wilt thou that we prepare the Pass-over &c. ver. 17, 18, 19. Now when Even was come, he sat down with the Twelve &c. ver. 20. And the same night (being the latter of the two days mentioned ver. 2.) he was betrayed by Judas; as follows in the Chapter. The words *After two days* being taken inclusively.

A like Answer may serve for your other Instance (for you have but two) concerning the *Two Witnesses*. Rev. 11. 11. *After three days and an half the spirit entered into them, and they stood upon their feet &c.* that is, *After three days and an half were come* (not *after three days and an half were past*;) as it is every where else. Nor do you give us one instance to the contrary, where it must be otherwise understood. And yet I must not call this *trifling*, or say that *I am sorry to see it*. For you yet insist upon it *Rep. p. 22.* that it is not so weak as the Doctor represents it.

But, you say further, *Rep. p. 24.* *If after eight days did here include the first of the eight, and exclude the day after the eighth, (as doubtless it doth;) Yet here is no abrogating the Seventh-day Sabbath, nor instituting the First.* This you should have said at first, (without quareling at *after eight days*;) But we are not now inquiring What is to become of the *Seventh-day*, or Whether the *First* shall be called a Sabbath; But, whether here be not a *second Precedent* for celebrating the first day. And these *Two Precedents*, in the *Two First Weeks* from the Resurrection, are Precedents of Christ himself with his Disciples; and a good Pattern for them and us to follow. On how many more *first days* he did so appear to them, we know not: We do not read that he did, nor do we read that he did not. I will not say the next Precedent is that of Pentecost. (*Disc. p. 93. 98.*) Christ on the day of the Resurrection (the first day of the week) had renewed his promise of *sending the Holy Ghost* (but *not* yet) and on the day of Pentecost (the first day of the Week also) he fulfilled this promise, *Act. 2.* in a miraculous manner. They were all *with one accord in one place*, ver. 1. (they were unanimously assembled as on a solemn occasion) when the *Holy Ghost* fell upon them in the similitude of *Cloven Tongues*, ver. 2, 3, 4. And Peter preached to a great Congregation (of *Parthians, Medes, Egyptians, &c.* ver. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.) upon that occasion, ver. 14. &c. and with so good success,

cells, as that *the same day* were added to them about three thousand souls, ver. 41. Now that here was a very solemn Religious Assembly on the day of Pentecost, attended with such Miraculous Success, you do not deny. But will not allow it to be the first day of the week. Rep. p. 36. You know (you say) was *not* for that, nor other ground but *Congregares*, and some *Romish Traditions* in the case? I thought I had proved it very plainly. *Discl.* p. 37, 38. (not out of the *Romans*, but) from *Levit.* 23. (of which you please to take no notice.) The *Wave-offering* was to be the *morrow after the Sabbath* ver. 11. and ye shall count to you from the *morrow after the Sabbath*, from the day that ye brought the *Wave-offering*, seven *Sabbaths* shall be complete, even unto the *morrow after the seventh Sabbath* shall ye number fifty days; and then was to be the *feast of weeks* or *Pentecost*. And is not the *morrow after their Sabbath*, the first day of their week? Which proof is so clear, that you thought best to say nothing of it, but rather to talk of *Romish Traditions*. If the word *Pentecost* displease you (that is, the *fiftieth day*.) instead of what is called the *feast of Weeks*, *Deut.* 16. 9, 10; I had it not from any *Romish Tradition*, but from *Act.* 2. 1. and *1 Cor.* 16. 8.

Now if I were as fond to stretch (for an Institution) as sometimes you seem to be; how fair an opportunity is there from hence to urge, that, beside the *weekly Sabbath* on the *Seventh day*, God hath here appointed the *feast of Pentecost*, on the *morrow after the Sabbath*, which *feast of Pentecost* was to be a *Sabbath* also (no service to be done thereon, *Levit.* 23. 1. and your self call it a *Sabbath*, Rep. p. 48.) as if it had been designed as a type or fore-runner of the *Christian Sabbath* to succeed on the *morrow after the Jewish Sabbath*. I might urge the same from the *Wave-offering*, ver. 10, 11, which was also to be the *morrow after the Sabbath*, ver. 11. and 'tis called the *feast of first fruits*; Ye shall bring a *Sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest*, ver. 10. before which *first fruits* brought, they were not to eat any thing of the harvest, neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, ver. 14. And with allusion to this *Feast of first fruits* (on the *morrow after the Jewish Sabbath*) *Christ* (rising on the first day of the week) is said to be *risen from the dead*, the *first fruits of them that slept*, *1 Cor.* 15. 20. And again ver. 23. *Christ the first fruits*, afterwards *this that are Christ*; which *first fruits*, both in the Type, and in the Anti-type, was to be the *morrow after the Seventh-day Sabbath*; and itself a kind of *Sabbath* also, a holy Convocation, on which no servile work shall be done. Which two Feasts (of the *First-fruits* and *Pentecost*) seem to be the fore-runners of another Sabbath to be on the *morrow after the Seventh-day Sabbath*.

But you tell us *Rep. p. 36.* You think you can prove by the Word that *Pentecost* was on the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, and not upon the first day of the Week. By what Word? certainly not by the Word of God; For that says expressly *the morrow after the Seventh Sabbath* *Lev. 23. 11.* You say, *Christ kept the Pass-over on one day and the Jews on another.* What then? On whatever day *Christ* kept the Pass-over, this doth not make the morrow after the Sabbath not to be the first day of the Week. You do not certainly know (you say) what was the *Fiftieth day* from the true day on which *Christ* and his disciples kept the Pass-over. Nor is it any thing to the purpose if you did know it. 'Tis your great mistake here (and again *p. 48.*) to think the *fifty days* are to be reckoned from the day of the Pass-over: they are to be reckoned from the day of the Wave-offering, the morrow after the Sabbath (on which was to be the Wave-offering) and fifty days from thence is expressly called the morrow after the seventh Sabbath. A like mistake it is when you take the Month *Nisan* to be the first New-Moon after the Vernal Equinox, *Eng. p. 121.* and that the Month or Moon *Nisan* began after the Vernal Equinox, *p. 122.* For the Month *Nisan* or *Abib*, was that whose Full-Moon was next after the Vernal Equinox (or which was reputed so to be) though its New-Moon was oft before it, and might be fourteen days before. The fourteenth day might be before the Equinox, if but the Fiftieth day (the day of the Full-Moon, and first day of the Feast) were on or after the Equinox; or at least, by the Priest reputed so to be. But what you suggest as doubtful, *p. 122.* whether the fourteenth day was not reckoned from the day of the Equinox, is yet more extravagant. For how can the fourteenth day of the Month be the Fourteenth day from the Equinox, unless we would fancy the day of the Equinox to be always New-Moon. But this doth not concern our controversy. And this confidence (of proving it by the Word to be the Seventh-day Sabbath) when the Word says expressly it is the morrow after the Sabbath, is like what you tell us *Eng. p. 43.* and do again insist upon it, *Rep. p. 35, 36.* of *Christ's Ascension on the Sabbath day*; (and the day of Judgment likewise.) When yet in the same Chapter the time of *Christ's* abode with them after his Resurrection is expressly said to be forty days, *Acts. 1. 3.* (so which the day of his Resurrection was the First, and the day of his Ascension was the Last.) And, if the first of these Forty were (as is confest) the first day of the week, how is it possible that the last of the Forty can be the Seventh-day? But see how far Fancy can carry a man, when it works strongly! But because you do yet insist upon it, (*Rep. p. 35, 36.*) that *Christ's Ascension may be on a Sabbath day*, notwithstanding to clear a proof

from Scripture, that it was the last of forty days, whereas the first was Sunday, and therefore the last must needs be Thursday, not Saturday; as I had shewed Disc. p. 37. in Answer to your *Enq.* p. 43. I will consider once more what you bring for proof of it.

Two things you offer by way of Argument, First, that it is said *Mount Olives* (from whence Christ ascended) is said to be about a Sabbath-days journey from Jerusalem; and therefore on a Sabbath-day. And then, that Christ and his disciples were then assembled and Christ preached; therefore on a Sabbath-day. Which I shall consider distinctly.

As to the first, You tell us *Rep.* p. 35. that a Sabbath-day's journey was of old esteemed about two miles. (how old, you do not tell us;) now what's this but Tradition? And 'tis agreed, you take it by Geographers, that *Mount Olives* is about two Miles from Jerusalem. Admit it be so, what then? The Cities of the Levites (you say) were to reach two thousand Cubits from without the City, *Numb.* 35. 5. This, I doubt, is a mistake, for it is, ver. 4. the Suburbs of the Cities which you shall give to the Levites shall reach from the Wall of the City and outward, a thousand (not two thousand) cubits round about. So that from without the City was but one thousand Cubits; but from the middle was to be two thousand, as at ver. 5. Ye shall measure from without the City; (that is, inward from the utmost bounds to the middle of the City; for so the words are (*michut lagair*) from without to the City;) on the East-side two thousand Cubits, and on the South-side two thousand Cubits, and on the West-side two thousand Cubits, and on the North-side two thousand Cubits, and the City shall be in the midst; this shall be to them the Suburbs of the City; that is, the utmost compass of the Suburbs, in the midst whereof is the City. But in ver. 4. the City is not measured, but from the walls of the City outward; for so the words are (*michut lagair va-chutsa*) from the Wall of the City outward. So that from the utmost bounds to the wall was one thousand Cubits, and from thence to the Middle was another thousand Cubits; and therefore the length or breadth of the City from Wall to Wall, two thousand Cubits; (not two Miles;) and from the utmost bounds of the Suburbs, to the middle of the City, was two thousand Cubits. And, if you mean thus, we are as to this point agreed. You tell us also that in *Josh.* 3. 3. when the Ark was born toward Jordan, the people were to go after it, yet there was to be a space between them and it, about two thousand Cubits by measure, they were not to come nearer to it. Admit this also. What then? Is it any where in Scripture said that two thousand Cubits is a Sabbath-days journey? Now what shall these Cubits in

measure did extend to, the Jews, you say, would best tell us, (perhaps better than You or I) but what then? Who thought it (you say) about two Miles? What's this but Jewish Tradition? If they did so. But pray tell me, Which of all their Rabbins tells you that two thousand cubits, are two miles? Mr. Ainsworth in his Annotations on Exod. 16. 29. (from whence I suppose you borrow most of this) who was acquainted with the Jews and the Jewish measures better than so, makes it not above one mile; An Italian or English Mile: (and 'tis indeed not so much :) why do you make it twice so much? A Mile (mille passus) is a thousand paces, and two mile, is two thousand paces. Can you think a thousand cubits are as much as a thousand paces? No, nor half so much. For a cubit is but about half a yard, that is one foot and a half, or eighteen inches; and a pace is five feet. You are out in your Measures therefore as well as in your Numbers.

It had been shorter work (if you had a mind to let us know what you think to be the length of a Sabbath-days journey) to have said in brief, 'Tis agreed by Geographers that Mount Olivet is from Jerusalem about two miles, which is here called a Sabbath-days journey; and therefore a Sabbath-days journey, is about two miles. Which had been plain and easy, without troubling your self or us (as you speak) with dark conjectures and some uncertain (not Rounish, but) Jewish Traditions, which you can make nothing of. Those (Rabbins) who think a Sabbath-days journey to be two thousand cubits, do not think it to be two miles; and those who think it to be two Miles, think it to be much more than two thousand cubits (for these measures are inconsistent,) nor do I know that any man before you, did think a cubit to be five feet.

*But, be it more or less, the length of a Sabbath-days journey is nothing to our purpose: The text says, Then they (the disciples) returned to Jerusalem, from the Mount called Olivet; it is not the Temple, which was near to Jerusalem (and therefore it was not far to go) but how near? *Exod. 16. 29* containing a Sabbath-days journey. But what then? If a Sabbath-days journey were then the known name of a Jewish measure, was it not as near on a Thursday, as on a Sabbath day? 'Twas near, he tells you, and how near; but he doth not tell you by what day. Nor need he, for when he had before signified that it was the fourth day from the Resurrection, which was on Sunday (the first day of the week) we might know (without telling) that the fourth day must needs be Thursday, (the fifth day of the week) not on Saturday, the Sabbath day. But because the distance is here designed by the length of a Sabbath-days journey (a known length, it seems, amongst the Jews) you fancy it must needs*

needs be on the Sabbath-day, (as if it were not the same length every day in the week :) And this fancy, must bear down so clear a proof; that it could be no other than *Thursday*, the fifth day of the week, as being the last of *fourty*, whereof the first was *Sunday*. It seems rather to me, that it was to satisfy posterity, who would be inquisitive When and Where so considerable a thing happened as was our Saviours *Ascension*, and whereabout that place lay: So he tells them, it was the *Fourtheth* day from his *Resurrection* on the first day of the week, it was from a place called *Mount Olivet*, which was near to *Jerusalem*, and no farther from it than a *Sabbath-day* walk.

Your second Argument, which I promised to consider, was, That *Christ and his Disciples were then assembled, and Christ preached*. Enq. p. 43. Now if you admit this as a good Argument to prove it a *Sabbath day*; I think it serves our turn better than yours. For, that *Christ and his Disciples were assembled* on the day of the Resurrection the first day of the week, is certain, and past dispute: And it is as certain, that he did then preach to them: But how doth it appear that he preached to them on the day of his *Ascension*? It's like enough that he did (on whatever day it happened to be) give them a Farewell Discourse: but it is not here said so. 'Tis said indeed that during the *fourty days* wherein he was seen of them, he had given commandments to the *Apostles*, to whom he had shewed himself alive after his *Passion*, by many infallible proofs speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and had (when he assembled with them) commanded them to wait at *Jerusalem* till they should receive the *Holy-Ghost*, as he had before promised them, (*Acts* 1. 2, 3, 4, 5.) which I do acknowledge to be *Preaching*: But on which of the *fourty days* he thus preached, we are not told in this place, (but only that it was during these *fourty days* :) But in *Luke* 24. ver. 36. to the end of ver. 49. (and in the parallel places in the other Evangelists) we are told, on what day All this was done, namely, on the day of his *Resurrection*. So that, if this preaching, to them Assembled, do prove a *Sabbath-day*; it proves the first day of the week to be a *Sabbath*. We find nothing new on the day of his *Ascension*, (*Act* 1. 6, 7.) but his answering to that question, *Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?* to which his Answer was, *It is not for you to know the times and seasons, &c.* And I suppose, it is from the clearness of this my Answer, that in your *Reply* p. 35, 36. you think fit to wave this Argument. I am, here, only to beg the Reader's pardon, for holding him so long in the Answering of these two Arguments, which did so little need it.

The next Precedent is from *Acts* 20. 7. which, though a single instance, doth fairly intimate an usual practise of so doing. Upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. 'Tis here plain, that on the first day of the week there was a Religious Assembly; as appears by their religious exercise therein; and that it was a Christian Assembly, for it was the Disciples were thus assembled, and they were assembled to break bread, a Christian Service; and (as appears by the circumstances) a great Assembly; it was the Disciples (*οἱ μαθηταί*) not (*οἱ*) some of them; and so many as to be mounted up to the third loft, ver. 9. and Paul preached to them a long Sermon, continuing his speech till midnight. Which I take to be a fourth Precedent of celebrating the first day for religious service.

To this you make many exceptions, (that the number of them may supply their want of weight.)

First you except, (*Eng.* p. 55.) this is but once, it is but one Fact: (And this One, Once, is repeated more than once, twice, or thrice; *Eng.* p. 55, 56. we have it ten times within less than the quantity of one page.) But one such Precedent of celebrating the Seventh day Sabbath, (after God's Resting *Gen.* 2. 2, 3. and before that of *Exod.* 16.) would do you special service, if you could find it. And this once is so set down as fairly to intimate it was wont to be. And the first day of the week, when they were come together to break bread, Paul preached, &c. would fairly intimate to a candid Reader, that they then came together to break bread as being the first day of the week; on which they used to come together for that purpose. I had put a case, *Disc.* p. 38. (which you have not thought fit to answer,) if you could find in the Book of *Job*, that on the seventh day of the week when *Job* and his friends were assembled for the joint service of God, *Bildad* spake thus, &c. whether you would not think it a good proof that the seventh day Sabbath was then wont to be observed? I put the case again for you to consider of.

You then except (if I understand you aright) to the word *Preached*. For so your words are, *Eng.* p. 55. In answer to which objection (that is, to our Argument from this place) the Reader (you say) may take notice that the Greek word here [*Preached*] is the same word which is rendered [*Reasoned*] *Acts* 17. 2. and *Acts* 18. 4. Which I do not see how it can come in by way of Answer to our Argument otherwise than by extenuating the word *Preached*, as too high a word for this place, the same Greek word (*διηγεῖται*) being elsewhere translated *Reasoned*. To which my answer was this

this (Disc. p. 29.) *Be it so; and, if that word will please him better, let it be so here.* He Reasoned, Discoursed, Treated, or did Hold forth; (that, I think will not alter the case;) and he Continued or Held-on (ἡρώων) this Discourse, this Speech, this Sermon (ἡρώων Sermonem) till mid-night; he held-on this Holding-forth till mid-night;) which I take to be the same thing with what we now call Preaching, or very like it. ('Twas a long continued Discourse, to a Congregation met together upon a Religious account, for the Service of God.) But let it be called (if he please) A Religious Discourse, of the Holy Apostle, to a Congregation of Christians, met together for such a purpose. This is the whole of what I said on this occasion.

But with this you are highly displeased; Repl. p. 31. He renders (you say) *ἡρώων Holding-forth*; (No. The Dr. renders it Preached; but gives you leave, if you like that word better, to render it Held forth;) and this rendering Holding-forth the Dr. does twice. And p. 32. This (of suggesting Reasoned instead of Preached) the Doctor seems to take offence at: (No; but allows you so to render it) and gives leave to render it Paul did hold forth, (yes, or by any of these other words I mentioned;) and (instead of He continued his speech) that he Held on his Holding-forth till midnight. Which Expression of Holding-forth hath been much abused in this Age by some Men, against Eminently Holy and Learned Non-conforming Ministers, when they have been accused as Male-factors for preaching the Gospel, to scorn, reproach and despise them as Holders-forth, &c. And the Expression of Holding-forth being taken in an ill and despicable sense by some who so use it; I think the Doctor might have spared to put it upon Paul, who in preaching Christ was then a Non-conformist Minister; and it seems, if it were not written incautiously, to be Highly Blamable. In which Expressions of Holding-forth, with others afterwards which refer to Spiritual Praying and Praising, as this does to Preaching the Gospel, (Does the Doctor any where speak against Spiritual Praying, Praising or Preaching?) the Doctor goes in bad Company, and I doubt highly gratifies them while he writes so agreeably to their Language. Which words of the Doctor, however written with some seeming softness, are a very Ill Breat, if they were meant, which I hope they were not, as they are commonly understood by all Good and Bad Men that I know. And all this but for Naming the word Holding-forth, though with allowance.

Now what need all this? *Tantum animis celestibus ira?* Do not you know, that the Phrase of Holding-forth was taken up by Non-conformists? about the Year 1642 or 1643; as I remember, at least I do not remember to have heard it sooner. It might

perhaps by the *Dissenting Brethren* be brought with them out of *Holland*) and in contradiction to the word *Preaching* and used by them (or some of them) so long and so frequently, till it began to be thought a ridiculous *Affectation*, and did afford matter of Drollery to those that had a mind to be pleasant? (And whether or no the word be yet left off, I do not know; though now the word *Speaking* be come in use in the same sense.) It was taken up upon this occasion; when it grew frequent for *Gifted Brethren* (if I may so call them without offence, as they were wont to call themselves) to speak publicly in their Meetings; they were then shy of calling this *Preaching*, but called it (by a softer name) *Holding-forth*; and 'twas usual to ask, *Who held-forth to day?* But when they began to be laughed out of this, it was then *Who did speak to day?* Not thinking it fit to call it *Preaching*, when the Speaker was not a Minister or other Church-Officer. And I know no great hurt in the word (saying that it seems a *Needless Affectation*.) For to *Sew-forth*, or *Hold-forth* (*exhibere*) are in themselves no bad Expressions, (and the best words that are may be *dressed-upon*, or turned into *Ridicule*, by those who have a mind so to do;) and therefore (though I would not choose to use it, yet) if others please so to speak, I can admit it. And in this place, if you do not like the word *Preaching*, I am content you make use of your own word, or any of those mentioned, or any of a like import: For, what ever you please to call it, this *Discourse* of Paul to a *Christian Congregation*, was at least a *Religious Exercise* on the *first day of the week*; Which serves the present Argument as well as if you call it *Preaching*. And I thought I had accommodated the matter with such a temper, as might serve both; If you neither like the word *Preaching*, nor *Holding-forth*; Let it be called a *Religious Discourse, of the Holy Apostle, to a Congregation of Christians, met together for such a purpose*. Which I take to be inoffensive words.

But 'tis further aggrivated that the Doctor does twice so render it. No; but does twice permit you so to use it if you please. And truly if in the first place you render *ἡλίσσον* by *held-forth*, it is very proper in the second place to render *ῥηλίσσον* by *holding-forth*; for *ῥηλίσσον* is but a Noun from the same Verb *ἡλίσσον*. And whether *ῥηλίσσον* be rendered by *continuing* or *holding-on*, is much one, for they signify both alike: and then I know not what (in this second place) should offend you anew, unless the *paronomasia* (of *holding-on his holding-forth*) offend your Ear. And if neither *preaching* nor *holding-forth* do please you, I gave you the choice of a great many other words.

But

But since the Expression of *Holding-forth*, hath been taken in an *ill* and *Despightful* sense by some, (you do not charge me to be one of those some, and therefore to this I shall make no defense; but onely that, as to this word, I go in *ill company*,) against *Eminently Holy and Learned Non-conforming Ministers*; you think (p. 32.) I might have spared to put it upon Paul, who was then a *Non-conformist Minister and Preacher*. Did I call Paul a *Non-conformist Preacher*? or is it you who call him so? (I hope you do it not to *disparage Paul*, but to *credit the Non-conformists*.) Nor does the Doctor put it upon Paul. We say Paul preached, 'tis you find fault with that word, without telling us what word you would have instead of it. Which word if you do not like, I give you leave to use your own, or to take your choise of many more.

But must all be right that all our *Non-conformists* say or do? and must none of them be touched for what ever they do or say, because St. Paul, (you say) was a *Non-conformist*? May no body speak to the disadvantage of *Jews, Anabaptists, Papists, or Quakers*, (for all these are *Non-conformists*) or so much as name the word *Dipping*, because (you say) Paul was a *Non-conformist*? May we not name *Monkery, Monks and Romish Prelates*, or *Papish Rebellious Subjects and Clergy*, (as Enq. p. 117, 121,) because Paul was a *Non-conformist*? I think 'tis too great a Privilege: and too great an over-weening of your selves to expect or claim it. Surely some *Non-conformists* (for there be a great many sorts of them) may be blamed for somewhat they do, notwithstanding Paul's being a *Non-conformist*.

You might have called him a *Conformist* if you pleased, for you tell us He came to the Synagogue, and preached there every Sabbath-day: which you suppose to comprehend and include all the rest that was requisite to the keeping the Sabbath (perfectly as to Christ; and as to the Apostles, in their measure) else we should have read it there objected against them, which we do not find, Rep. p. 33. He shored his head at Cenchrea because he had a Vow, Act. 18. 18. He caused Timothy to be circumcised because his Mother was a Jew, Act. 16. 1. He would by all means keep the Feast at Jerusalem, Act. 18. 21. (which you take to be the Pass-over, Enq. p. 122.) and to that purpose went from Ephesus to Jerusalem, though he were thence to return again. And the like for Pentecost, if possible, Act. 20. 16. And Act. 21. 20, 21, 23, 24, 26. He joins in the Ceremonies of Purification, with four men that had a Vow; and this to vindicate himself from the reproach which was raised upon him (as a *Non-conformist*) that he taught the Jews which were among the Gentiles

to forsake Moses, and that they ought not to circumcise their children, nor to walk after the customs: to confute which calumny, he thus complied, that all might know that those things whereof they were informed concerning him (touching his Non-conformity) were not so, but that himself also walked orderly, and kept the Law. (that is the Ceremonial Law, the Law spoken of ver. 21. they (the Jews) which believe and are all zealous of the Law.) And when he was accused as faulty therein, he stands upon his justification, Chap. 24. 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20. and again Chap. 26. 7, 8, 10, 11. that neither against the Law of the Jews, nor against the Temple, nor against Cesar, had he offended in any thing, nor could they prove the things whereof they accused him: And we find Lysias, Felix, Festus, and King Agrippa acquitting him, as having done nothing worthy of death or of bonds, Chap. 23. 23. Chap. 24. 22, 23. Chap. 25. 18, 19. Chap. 26. 31. according to what he tells us elsewhere, that to the Jew he became as a Jew, and was as to the Law blameless: Phil. 3. 5, 6. Though yet you own, Enq. p. 123. that, after the death of Christ, he was under no obligation, to keep that Feast of the Pass-over, but was, by his death, delivered from that as well as all other Ceremonies, which are all nailed to his Cross. Now when he was thus compliant, though under no obligation so to be, I see not why you should reproach him as a Non-conformist Preacher. You might as well call him a Separatist, because at Ephesus Act. 19. 9. he departed, from those that spake evil of the way, and separated the Disciples, disputing daily in the School of one Tyrannus.

'Tis true, that St. Paul did preach some Doctrines which were not pleasing to the unconverted Jews: but this doth not make him a Non-conformist, so long as in Practice he did comply with what the Mosaic Law required of him. And 'tis possible (and perhaps you may think so) that some of our own Conformists may sometimes preach otherwise than according to the Established Doctrine of the Church of England, who yet would not be thought Non-conformists for so doing. Now, whether you intend it for a Reproach or a Commendation of St. Paul to call him a Non-conformist; however, when he makes it his business to Purge himself of this Imputation, and stands upon his Justification, that the Jews could not prove it upon him (nor can you) but that he walked orderly and kept the Law, and was, as touching the righteousness which is in the Law, blameless: You ought not to fasten upon St. Paul the nickname of a Non-conformist. Yet I do not take St. Paul to be such a Conformist, as to take All as he finds it (right or wrong) with those amongst whom he lives; or to swallow all without chewing (as your language

language is *Rep.* p. 59, 60.) But, wherein he might without sin, he was content to become all things to all men, that he might save some; he was willing, for the advantage of the Gospel, to comply in things which he thought *Lawful*, though not *Necessary*; as your self own (*Eng.* p. 122, 123.) as to his keeping the Pass-over at Jerusalem, though under no obligation to keep it. And the like I take to be, his going into the Jews Synagogue on their Sabbath-day; his Circumcising Timothy; his Purification in the Temple; his Shaving his head at Cenchrea, and the like. And so (for ought appears) as to the whole Mosaic Law.

Nor is he to be charged (for his compliance) as teaching one thing and practising the contrary (as you seem to insinuate *Eng.* p. 73.) For he taught indeed that the Gentiles were not to be brought under the Yoke of the Ceremonial Law (to which before they were not subject) but he doth no where teach (that I know of) that the Jews amongst the Gentiles might not observe it, if they were so perswaded. He bids the Gentiles, to stand fast in the liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free *Gal. 5. 1. Phil. 4. 1.* But he doth no where forbid the Jews to waive that privilege (if they were so perswaded) upon a just occasion. And, according to this Doctrine was his Practice also, in Circumcising Timothy (because his Mother was a Jew,) but not Circumcising Titus, (who was a converted Gentile.) And, 'tis your great mistake not to distinguish between the Gentiles, and the Jews among the Gentiles; which distinction, if well considered, would set you right in many points whereat you stumble.

But, to return from this Digression in Vindication of St. Paul: I shewed those Papers, and particularly that passage which doth so much offend you, to Non-conformist Preachers (one or more) before 'twas Printed; who took no offense at it, nor made any exception to it. And I think it had been your wisdom (if you had not liked it) at least to say nothing of it, rather than to make so great an out-cry for nothing. What is that ill sense of the word *Holding-forth* which is commonly understood (you say) by all good and bad men, I do not know. I mean it in that sense in which Non-conformists were wont to use it, for that of Gifted-brethren in contradistinction to the Preaching of Non-conformist Ministers: 'Twas all one, as to my business, whether Paul did here speak, (as you are please to call him) as a Non-conformist Preacher, or as a Gifted-brother; for, either way, it was a Religious Exercise in a Christian Assembly on the first day of the week.

In the mean while, Do you think there are not some eminently

Holy

Holy and learned Conforming Ministers (yes, and *Non-conformists* too) which do observe the *Christian Sabbath*, with whom you make bold all along, as *worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, (beside many other unhandsome insinuations,) when there was no occasion for it.

Now, if you be not *angry*, (as *Rep.* p. 38. you say I am) or if your heat be a little over that we may talk calmly, I see not why *διαλέγων* may not here be well translated *Preached*, as our Translators have rendered it. That the word may be so rendered, you do not deny; for (*Eng.* p. 45, 55. and *Repl.* p. 32.) you would have it so rendered *Act.* 17. 2. and *Act.* 18. 4. And why you would have it so rendered there, but not here, I can guess at no other Reason, but one of these two; Either because our Translators there have said *Reasoned*, and here *Preached*, and therefore (because there may be some pleasure in contradicting and finding fault) you would have the contrary: Or else because, what is there said, was on the *Jewish Sabbath* (where you think the *highest expression* fit to be used,) but in this place, being but on the *first day of the week*, you think *Preaching* too good a word. But since *διαλέγων* may be rendered by either word, according as may best suit with the Circumstances of the place: I think our Translators have, with very good judgment, so rendered it as they have done in all those places. The Discourse of *Paul* at *Thessalonica* *Act.* 17. 2. and of *Aquila* at *Corinth* *Act.* 18. 4. doth not seem to have been a *Continued Discourse* (such what we use to call *Preaching*;) but an *Interrupted Conference* (*Dialogue-wise*) *Convincing the Jews and Greeks* by way of Arguing, Answers, and Replies: And while he did thus *διαλέγων Dialogue-wise*, it was more proper to call it *Reasoning* or *Disputing*, (as *Act.* 17. 17. *Act.* 18. 19. *Act.* 19. 9.) than to call it *Preaching*: and therefore was well rendered *Reasoned* in those places: But in the present place *Act.* 20. 7. it was a *Continued discourse*; not *Arguing with them*, (by way of Dialogue) but making a *continued Speech to them*; which is therefore called *ᾠροῦν*, not *διαλέγων*, and is fitly rendered *Preaching*. But whether in a *Continued* or *Interrupted* discourse, 'tis all one as to our Business; for *Catechising* is a *Religious Discourse*, as well as *Preaching*. And you are no way advanced in your affair, by quarelling at the Translation.

Another Exception (I must not call it a *Cavil*, though that word be frequent with you) is about the words *To break bread*, which you will not allow us to understand of the *Lords Supper*. But neither doth this advance your business at all; for whether they did or did not celebrate the *Lords Supper*, 'twas at least a *Christian Assembly*

Assembly (and you affirm it so to be *Rep.* p. 33.) on the *first day of the week*. This *breaking of bread*, you say *Eng.* p. 56, 57. (to which you refer *Repl.* p. 32.) might be to receive the *Lords Supper* together, (as doubtless it was) or it might be (you say) for common eating or supping together (as friends commonly do, when a Minister or any special acquaintance intends to take a journey in the morning, to sup with him over night.) But do you think this was so? If not, to what purpose is this objection? That *Breaking of bread* is elsewhere used for the *Lords Supper* you do not deny, nor seem to doubt; and why not here? I do not know that the phrase is any where used in all the New Testament in any other sense. What you allege of Christs *breaking the loaves and fishes* (*Mat.* 14. 19. and *Mat.* 15. 36. and *Mark* 8. 6, 19.) for a *miraculous feeding of the multitude*, is nothing to the purpose; for that's another phrase and form of speech (on another occasion) from this of *breaking bread*, indefinitely. What you allege of *Paul* *Act.* 27. 35. when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all, and when he had broken it, he began to eat; May be the *Lords Supper*, for ought I know, with other *Christians* then in the ship with him. 'Tis the same form of speech with that of *Christ* *Luk.* 22. 19. *Mat.* 26. 26. He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave them, saying, Take, eat, &c. And why it should not here be understood in the same sense, I see not. If all in the ship were not *Christians*, (as it's likely they were not all) yet I see not why those of them which were so, might not there celebrate the *Lords Supper*, on that occasion. For *St. Paul* was not ashamed to own himself a *Christian*, even in that company. And that of *Act.* 20. 11. seems plainly so to be, They came together to break bread ver. 7. and they did break bread before they parted, ver. 11. (though interrupted a while by the fall of *Eutychus*.) That is, they did celebrate the *Lords Supper* ver. 11. for which they came together ver. 7. On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break Bread, *Paul* preached unto them being ready to depart on the morrow----- and when he had Broken Bread----- he departed. Why should we not think this *breaking of bread* to be that *breaking of bread* for which they came together. But I press this no further, because *Repl.* p. 132, 134. you seem content to admit it without farther insisting on it, save onely referring to what was said before.

Another scruple we have about *μὴ οὐββήμεν* (for we must dispute every inch of ground) and it comes twice; as to this place of *Act.* 20. 7. and as to that of *1 Cor.* 16. 2. whether *μὴ οὐββήμεν* do signify

the first day of the week: and you think much (*Repl. p. 34.*) that I should call it *trifling*; which is, you say, a *hard word*. (I could have given it a *harder word*; but know not well by what *softer name* to call it than *trifling*.) *It may be remembered*, you say (*Eng. p. 57.*) the Greek word *μία* signifies *One*, and *ἡ μία ἡ* is rendered (not the First, but) *One*, about an hundred times in our Translation of the New Testament; and (*p. 58.*) *μία σαββάτων* (which we translate *the first day of the week*) you render by *one of the Sabbaths*, and to the same purpose *Repl. p. 34.*

Now 'tis very true that *μία* in Greek doth signify *One*, (and it may be so translated, for ought I know, as often as you say.) But if you were so good a Critick as to correct the Translation, you might have known that *μία σαββάτων* cannot signify *One of the Sabbaths*, for then it should have been *ἡ σαββάτων*, because *σαββάτων* is the Neuter Gender. Would you think *Una Sabbatorum* to be good *Latine* for *one of the Sabbaths*? And you do not much mend it when you say, *One of the week* meaning *One day of the week*; for if by *one* you mean *some one*, it should then be *ἡ μία*, not *μία ἡμέρας*. And *Mat. 28. 1.* it dawned or drew near *ἡ μία ἡμέρα* to the one, not to *some one day* indefinitely, but to *that certain day* which was known by the name of *μία σαββάτων*, and so here *ἡ μία* in *The one*, &c. And what *that one* is, you may learn in *Mar. 16.* where what is called *μία σαββάτων ver. 1.* is *ἡ μία σαββάτων ver. 9.* both signifying the same thing *the first day of the week*. And in *Gen. 1. 5.* where *echad* in the Hebrew, and *μία* in the Greek, do properly signify *One*, yet you scruple not to render it (again and again) *the evening and the morning was the first day*, (not *one day*,) even after I shewed you that both in the Hebrew and in the Greek it is *One*. For we are to understand words in such a candid sense as in common-intendment may be reasonably supposed to be meant, not according to what *force* may be put upon them. As (in the instance I gave you, how slight soever you make of it,) *five pound* (singly considered) may signify *five pound of candles* as well as *five pound of money*; but he that sells a horse for *five pound* shall be presumed to intend it of *money* (not of *candles*.) And, though *μία* be Greek for *One*, yet when the known sense of *μία σαββάτων* is commonly understood to be what we call *the first day of the week*, (and no where known to be used in any other sense) 'tis captious to render it *one day of the week*, thereby meaning *some one*. If I called it *child's play* (as you object *Repl. p. 34.*) it is because I thought you might have been taught at *School* (as I was) that *μία σαββάτων* signifies *the first day of the week*. See more to this purpose *Disc. p. 30, 31.* and again

again p. 39, 40, 41, 42. Where, to help your Criticism, I give you the true construction of those words *μία σαββάτου*, which are well translated *the first day of the week* (for this is the day designed by those words, and this the most familiar or usual expression for it) but it is not a *literal* translation; the words be Elliptical, and to be thus supplied, *μία (ἡμέρα ὀψὲς) σαββάτου*, that is *one (day after the) Sabbath*, (the Substantive *ἡμέρα* being understood in the Adjective *μία*, and the Proposition *ὀψὲς* before the Genitive case *σαββάτου*) which is the same in sense with *the first day of the week*. And such Elliptical or short forms of Expression (in words of frequent use) are very familiar in all Languages; You may remember *Ventum erat ad Vestem* (*subaudi Templum*;) *hujus video Byrriam*, (*subaudi servum*;) in the same form of speech as we say, *I came to St. Maries*, meaning *St. Maries Church*; *I was at Trinity*, meaning *Trinity College*; *I saw your Robert*, meaning *your Man Robert*; or *your John*, meaning *your Son John*; and (*Eng.* p. 119.) you put *Sabbati* for *die Sabbati*; and this for *in die Sabbati*. And you oft refer us to the *Word*, meaning *the Word of God contained in the holy Scriptures*; (and I am willing so to understand you all along,) would you have me here argue, that there be many *Words* beside the *Word of God*, and by *Word* you may signify somewhat else? So, *He preached at Peters Cornhill*, meaning *St. Peters (Church, in) Cornhill*: *He lives in Margarets Westminster*, meaning *St. Margarets (Parish, in) Westminster*; So *In the Strand London*, meaning *the Strand (near) London*; and *Bennets Pauls-wharf*, meaning *St. Bennets (Church, near) Pauls-wharf*, and *Pauls-wharf*, meaning *the wharf (near to the Church of St.) Paul*: and you can hardly read the Supercription of a Letter, but you will meet with such short forms of speech. So in Latine *tertio Calendas*, is *tertio (die ante) Calendas*; and in Greek *μία σαββάτου*, is *μία (ἡμέρα ὀψὲς) σαββάτου*, *one (day after the) Sabbath*; that is, *the first day of the week*. And as *one hour after twelve* is *one a-clock*; *two hours after twelve* is *two a-clock*, *three hours after twelve* is *three a-clock*; so *one day after the Sabbath*, is *the first day of the week*, *two days after the Sabbath* is *the second day of the week*, *three days after the Sabbath* is *the third day of the week*; which is easily understood by any who is not disposed to (*Cavil* I was about to say, but let it be to) *make needless Exceptions*. And I find that at length (*Repl.* p. 34.) you are content to say by *μία σαββάτου* *Act.* 20. 7. *I think may be meant the first day of the week*, (you should rather have said, *I think it is meant*; surely you will not say, you think *it is not* so meant;) yet you are still hankering upon your *μία signifies One*, (and it doth so,) but you should remember also that it is not *in*

(*some one*) but *μια* a determinate one, sufficiently designed by this name: (on *that* day which is *one day after the Sabbath*.) And then, that it is not the same to say *one day of the week*, (as you would have it) as to say *one day after the Sabbath* (that is, the *first* day of the week,) like as it is not the same to say *one hour of the day*, as to say *one hour after twelve*. So that I hope you will not question hereafter but that it was on *the first day of the week* that Paul did there *preach* and celebrate the *Lords Supper* at *Troas*. But since you are now content to allow (*Rep.* p. 28, 34. *Eng.* p. 58.) that by *μια* *πρωτη* is generally meant the first day of the week, and in some places certainly so meant, and *may be* so meant in this place, and *probably is* so meant here, (to which you may add, that it doth not appear *any where* to be otherwise meant, nor do you offer any reason or pretense of reason *why not* so meant here as it is every where else,) I hope you will not be offended with me for calling it *trifling* to tell us again and again (and yet to insist upon it) that *μια* signifies *one*. If in an Argument at *Westminster-hall*, when it doth appear that such a thing was done *one hour after twelve a-clock*, you should still insist upon it that *six a-clock* is *one hour*, and that it is *after twelve*, and therefore this might be at *six a-clock* (or any other hour of the day) and would be thought *in earnest* when you so argue; you would not be offended if the *Bar* or the *Bench* should take this to be *trifling*, and the best excuse that could be made for it, would be, *Surely he is not in earnest*.

But you are content (*Eng.* p. 55, 56, 57. *Repl.* p. 33, 34.) to compromise the matter; you will allow this to be the first day of the week, if we will admit *Sunday-night* to begin on *Saturday* at *Sun-set*. (That is, if it may serve your turn, it shall be the first day of the week: otherwise, it shall not.) *It seems to you*, you say; (it may be so;) and you think to these Objectors also (pray forbear to say that any more) that Pauls *preaching* on the first day of the week and continuing his speech till *midnight*, was the *Evening after the Seventh day*, (that is, on *Saturday night*) Paul being to depart on the *morrow*, that is on *Sunday*; and that after *Supper* (on *Saturday-night*) Paul preached to them and talked long till *break of day*, and then departed, which seems to be *Sunday-morning*. And you are not pleased that I should think this a pleasant shift, which seems to you a plain and true fact, *Repl.* p. 33. But however it seem to you, pray forbear to think it so seems to the objectors: for I believe you are the first that ever thought so; the first who ever thought, that those, who produce this place for the *Sunday Sabbath*, do understand it

of

of *Paul's* preaching on *Saturday-night*, being ready to depart on *Sunday-morning*. And you allow your self a great latitude in *thinking*, when you think it doth so seem to them. But do you indeed think so? Or may I return you your own words, *Repl. p. 35. I hope you will not oblige me, or any other, to believe you so think?*

But this is to usher in another debate, at *what time* the day did *then* begin; of which conceit you seem to be very full; that *Sunday-night* was what others call *Saturday-night*, beginning at Sun-set on Saturday; and that this was the language there (at that time) of *St. Luke* and the other sacred Writers; and all this, because *The morning and the evening was the first day*, Gen. 1. 5.

Now I had shewed it very plain, *Disc. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32.* that as well in the New Testament as in the Old, the *Evening* was always reckoned to belong to the day *past*. We find, by the story we have of Christs Resurrection (*Mat. 28. Mar. 14. Luk. 24. Job. 20.*) that *on the first day of the week, very early in the morning, while it was yet dark, the women came to the sepulchre*; not over-night, (though the Sun, at that time of the Year, did set about six a-clock) because the Sabbath was not yet past, and they were to *rest on the Sabbath according to the Commandment*. When they came there, the Body was risen, and Christ appeared to them, and bid them tell it to the Disciples, which they did; after which, *Peter* and *John* (from the rest) went to the Sepulchre and found it to be so, and brought such word back to the rest; and in the mean time the souldiers (affrighted) told to the high Priests what had happened, who gave them money to say, The Disciples had stolen away the Body while they slept; and all this happened *before* the two Disciples went toward *Emmaus*, (for they told it to Christ by the way.) After that, they went on foot (they walked) to *Emmaus*, which you allow to be *seven mile and a half*; when they came near to *Emmaus*, the day was far spent, and they perswade Christ, (who seemed willing to go further) to stay with them, as not being convenient, unless upon some great occasion, to travel further that night. He there stayed with them, continued to preach to them, and did with them celebrate the *Lords Supper* before they perceived who he was. After this, they returned to *Jerusalem*, (another seven miles and half) and told this to the Disciples. After which, Christ also appeared to them, upbraided their unbelief, confirmed their Faith, preached to them the Doctrine of his Death and Resurrection out of *Moses*, the *Psalms*, and the *Prophets*; gave them his solemn Benediction, conferred on them the Holy-Ghost, ordained them to that office, and gave them Com-
mission

mission for preaching the Gospel, and planting the Christian Church, with Instructions concerning it: Now can any man believe, that all this could be dispatched before six a-clock (the time of Sun-set at that season) when yet it was so late when they drew near to *Emmans* as that it was inconvenient to travel further? Yet all this was but *the same day in the evening, the first day of the week*, Joh. 10. 19. *when the doors were shut* (near bed-time.) The day therefore, which began before Sun-rising, was not ended at Sun-set, nor for a good while after. Nor did the new day begin at (the beginning of) the Evening; especially if you bring back *the Evening* so far as to *three a-clock* Repl. p. 28. or even to *Mid-day* p. 29.

The same I argued from the day of the Crucifixion. 'Twas toward Evening before the Crucifixion was over. For 'twas after *the sixth hour* (that is, our Noon) when *Pilate delivered him to the Jews to be crucified, and they led him away*. Joh. 19. 14, 16. after which a *Cross* was to be provided for him to carry to Mount Calvary, (about as far from Jerusalem on the one side as Mount Olivet is on the other; which you tell us Repl. 35, 36. was about two miles off,) and it may be reasonably supposed they did not travel very fast, when he was to carry the *Cross* all the way; or (when he failed under it) *Simon of Cyrene* for him. When they came there, the *Cross* was to be erected, and he fastened to it. By which time it might be about *three a-clock* or the *ninth hour*. And some-while after *the ninth hour* (that is after three a-clock) he cried, *Eli, Eli, lamma sabachthani*; whereupon they mocked him, as calling for *Elias*; and the two thieves (or one of them) reviled him. Then they went (how far I know not) and fetched a *sponge* and gave him *gall and vinegar to drink*; after all this (how long after we know not) he cried *Again with a loud voice and gave up the Ghost*. And 'tis likely enough (though it be not expressly said so) to be about *Sun-set* when he thus gave up the *Ghost*; that as Christ died on the *same day*, so at the *same hour*, at which the *Paschal Lamb* was to be sacrificed, at the going down of the Sun. Deut. 16. 6. And it was about *Sun-set*, when the souldiers came and brake the legs of the two thieves because they were not dead when it was time to take them down from the *Cross*, (that is, as you intimate Repl. p. 30. from Josh. 10. 26, 27. at the going down of the Sun, consonant to that of Josh. 8. 39. and Deut. 21. 23.) And then (by the way) if the Thieves were yet alive, how is it that Christ says to one of them, *This Day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*, unless *this day* did reach beyond *Sun-set*. But, after all this, it was later yet when *Joseph* begged his

his Body from Pilate; for 'tis expressly said, *When Even was come, Joseph begged his body*; that is *after Sun-set*, (for Repl. p. 30. you take pains to prove, from many places, *That the Evening doth begin at Sun-set*;) which was not granted presently, (for Pilate doubted whether he were yet dead, and demurred till he was satisfied therein; which must be from some who came thence, at two miles distance from Jerusalem, after he was dead:) and when it was granted, there must be some time to go back again from Pilate to Mount Calvary, and there to take down the body, to buy fine linen, to wrap it in a clean linen-cloth, to bury it in his Tomb; yet the Sabbath was not begun, for after this, 'tis expressly said that day was *the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on*; Yet after this *the women, who saw the sepulchre and how the body was laid, returned home*, (from thence to Jerusalem, I suppose) and prepared spices and ointments (the same night) yet *rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment*. But all this, you say, might well be before Sun-set. Pray, how so? since *Evening begins at Sun-set*, Rep. p. 30. and *Evening was come before Joseph begged the body of Pilate*, Mat. 27. Mar. 15. Luk. 23. How then can, all that followed, be done before Sun-set? If you think it was, you may continue so to think, if you please; but you must give me leave to think otherwise. When therefore so much was done after *the Evening was come* (that is after Sun-set) and the Sabbath not yet begun; *the Sabbath did not begin at Sun-set* as you would have it.

Nor did it End at Sun-set the next day. For the Women, who had prepared spices and ointments the night before, might that night, after six a-clock, have applyed them; (for the darkness would not hinder them, it being then but just past the Full Moon, if past, and they would it seems have done it the night before, notwithstanding the darkness, but that the Sabbath came on so soon as not to afford them time enough, and they did come the next morning while it was yet dark,) but, because the Sabbath was not yet over, and they were to rest the Sabbath-day according to the commandment, they waited till the next morning before they could come to anoint the Corps. I add also, that if the Sabbath had ended at six a-clock, and the day after the Sabbath had then begun, Christ might have risen that Evening, (as well as the next Morning) for the third day had been then begun. Yet, on the other hand, (since 'tis manifest that Christ was not buried till after Sun-set) if that Evening had not been part of the sixth day, he had not been three days and three nights, (that is, three *νύκτες*.) in the heart of the Earth, that is, in the grave. (for it had been but part

of

of the second and part of the third, but no part of the first,) 'Tis manifest therefore that the *Evening at the end of the sixth day* was part of the sixth day; and the *Evening at the end of the seventh day* was part of the seventh day (not as you would have it here, the first day of the week.) And consequently Paul's preaching on the first day of the week till midnight ready to depart the next morning was not on Saturday-night (and he to depart on Sunday-morning,) but it was on Sunday-night and he to depart on Monday-morning. And therefore the Doctor's *Mid-night-day*, as you please to call it *Rep. p. 30, 33.* (that is from *Midnight to Midnight*) is not mistaken, as there you think.

So *Act. 23. 32.* The chief Captain, being informed by Paul's Kinsman of a conspiracy to kill Paul, ver. 19, 20, 21. gave order to make ready two hundred souldiers to go to Cesarea at the Third hour of the night (which certainly was after Sun-set) to bring Paul safe to Felix the Governour, ver. 23, 24. And the souldiers, as was commanded them, took Paul and brought by night (*ὡς ἡ νύκτις*, that night) to Antipatris, ver. 11. 32. On the morrow (*τῇ ἑαυτεῶν*) they (the souldiers) left the horsemen to go with him, and returned to the Castle, ver. 32. so that the next morning, was (not the same day, but) the morrow after the third hour of the night foregoing. Which morrow did not then begin at Sun-set, but at least later than the third hour of the night: And you do acknowledge (*Rep. p. 29.*) that the Romans then did reckon their days from *Midnight to Midnight*, which were therefore as you call them (wittily no doubt) *Midnight-days*: And you own, that our English Day is also a *Midnight-day*, from Mid-night to Midnight: and 'tis so reputed in *Westminster-hall*. And so you tell us *Eng. p. 83.* that from *Midnight to Midnight*, is the *Reckoning of this Kingdom*. And what do you reply to all this Evidence? The *Evening and the Morning* were the first day must answer all.

I shewed you further, that even in the *Old Testament* it was so also. The *Paschal Lamb* was to be killed in the first Month on the Fourteenth day in the Evening, *Exod. 12. 6, 18, Levit. 23. 5. Numb. 28. 16. Deut. 16. 6.* Do you think this to be that at the end of the thirteenth day? No; but that at the end of the Fourteenth day. And it must be all eaten that night, nothing of it must remain till the morning, *Exod. 12. 18, 10.* that is, not after Mid-night, for when Midnight is past, Morning begins; What, nothing of it till the Morning of the Fourteenth day? Surely not so, but not till the Morning of the Fifteenth day. For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night (the night of this day, not to morrow-night, as if the night then following were the night of another day) and will smite all the

the first born ver. 12. and it came to pass at mid-night, that the Lord smote all the first-born of the land of Egypt ver. 18. so that till mid-night was the fourteenth day at evening, (not the fifteenth.) So *Exod. 12. 6, 8.* on the fourteenth day they shall kill it at evening, and they shall eat the flesh that Night (but before Mid-night) so that as well the Evening as the Night (at least till Mid-night) are reckoned to the fourteenth day. Yet you would have all dispatched before Sun-set. Again, They were to eat it with unleavened bread, and all leaven to be that night put away, and no leaven to be found in their houses, ver. 8. 18, 19, 20. What, no leaven on the fourteenth day? surely there might. *Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread,* ver. 15. and *seven days shall no leaven be found in your houses,* ver. 19. And the first of those Seven is the fifteenth day (not the Fourteenth,) therefore on the fourteenth day they might have Leaven; but from the fourteenth day at Even they might not; therefore the fourteenth day at Even was the end of the Fourteenth day (not the beginning of it, and therefore not at the end of the Thirteenth day) and this evening continued till mid-night, therefore so long continued the Fourteenth day. Now from the fourteenth day at evening, (that is, from the end of that Evening,) till the one and twentieth day at evening, (that is, till the end of this Evening,) ye shall eat unleavened bread; seven days shall no leaven be found in your houses; ver 18, 19. of which seven days, the fifteenth is the first. So *Levit. 23. 32.* From even to even, I take to be from the end of one Evening to the end of the next, with which you are not pleased, *Rep. p.* But (you say *Rep. p. 30.*) The Evening does begin at Sun-set (and take pains to prove it;) True: But it doth not end at Sun-set: It continues till Mid-night. And from the end of one evening, to the end of the next, is from Mid-night to Mid-night. And I have been told (by Men of your Profession) that from the day of the date hereof, is from the End of that day; that is, from the Mid-night following. (And, you know, some great Cases have turn'd upon this point.) And in what you cite, *Eng. p. 127.* (which place I doubt you mis-understood) about the Observation of the Pascha (that is Easter-day) from the Fourteenth of the Moon to the Twenty first; the meaning is not that the Pascha did all that while continue, but that these were the *limites Paschales* or *termini Paschales* (as they are wont to be called) within which the Pascha was to be kept; that is, From the end of the fourteenth day, to the end of the one and twentieth. Not so soon as the Fourteenth day, nor later than the one and twentieth, but on that Lord's-day (which could be but one) which did fall within these limits. Which is

the known meaning of those words. So *Levit. 23. 5, 6*: *The fourteenth day of the first month at Even, is the Lord's Pass-over, and on the fifteenth day is the feast of unleavened bread; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread.* And *Numb. 28. 16, 17*: *The fourteenth day of the first month is the Pass-over of the Lord; and in the fifteenth day is the feast; seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten.* So *Numb. 33. 3*: *They departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month, on the morrow after the Pass-over; Now the Lord's Pass-over (wherein he slew the Egyptians and passed over the Israelites) was about midnight on the fourteenth day at even; and presently upon it (before the morning light) the Israelites were sent out on the fifteenth day, It came to pass at Midnight the Lord smote all the first-born, — and Pharaoh rose up in the Night, — and called for Moses and Aaron by Night, and said Rise up, get ye forth, — And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people that they might send them out of the land in Hast, — and the children of Israel travelled for Rameses to Succoth, &c. *Exod. 12. 29, 30, 31, 37*. So that just after midnight was the Morrow after what was just before midnight. We have found therefore a mid-night-day (as you call it) even in the Old Testament. And *Deut. 16. 6*: *Thou shalt sacrifice the Pass-over at even, at the going down of the Sun, at the season that thou comest forth out of Egypt, (which was, midnight, *Exod. 12. 4*. *Exod. 12. 11*.) So that from Sun-set to Midnight is the time within which the Pass-over was to be Killed, and Roasted, and Eaten, and no part of it to remain till morning, (that is not after midnight, for then morning begins;) and what follows is the morrow after, and a new day: That was the Fourteenth, This is the Fifteenth.**

But in *Exod. 12. 6* they shall kill the Pass-over in the evening, or between the two evenings; you take the first of these evenings to begin either at our three o'clock in the afternoon, or presently after Mid-day, between which and Sun-set (you say) there might be time enough to kill and dress it without running up the time to midnight. I will not here press you with what you take pains to prove *Reph, p. 29, 30* that the evening begins at Sun-set, when the evening comes, is, when the Sun is down, p. 30. (though I should think the beginning of the evening should be the first evening, not the last.) But desire you to consult *Deut. 16. 6*: where you will find it was to be killed, not at three o'clock in the afternoon, nor presently after mid-day, but at the going down of the Sun, at the season that thou comest out of Egypt. Now, if it must be killed at the going down of the Sun, where shall we find time to kill it, dress it, roast it and eat it, without running up the time beyond Sun-set? Whether till mid-night or no is

not

not necessary, for if never so little beyond Sun-set, it must (according to your notion) trespass upon the *fifteenth day*, (whereas the *Past-over* is all to be dispatched on the fourteenth day; and the *fifteenth day* is the *morrow after the Past-over*.) And, how far we may run it up beyond Sun-set, the next words tell you, *at the season that thou camest out of Egypt, which was about midnight*: so that I think the case is plain, that *between the two evenings*, is *between Sun-set and Midnight*; for it must not be killed before Sun-set, and it must be all eaten before midnight, (*nothing of it must be left till the morning*.) It is plain therefore, that till the end of the *Lords Past-over* (which was about midnight or just before) was the *fourteenth day*; and the *fifteenth day* was the *morrow after*. The *fifteenth day* therefore did not begin on the fourteenth day at Sun-set, but at *Midnight*.

And *Nehemiah*, when he would *Restore* the Observation of the *Sabbath* which had been long intermitted (during the Captivity, and long before, as you tell us, *Eng. p. 39.63.*) did not reckon it to begin at Sun-set, nor for a good while after, *Neh. 13. 19. When the gates of Jerusalem began to be Dark before the Sabbath, I commanded the gates to be shut &c.* Not at Sun-set, but when the *Gates began to be dark*, which is not till a good while after Sun-set, and yet even that was *before the Sabbath*. The Sabbath was not yet begun, but the *Gates shut*, by way of prevention, when it grew toward the ordinary time of ceasing to go in and out; yet even then they were not so shut but that, upon occasion, they might be opened to let in ordinary passengers, (though not for those who brought merchandise to sell on the Sabbath-day,) and for that purpose left his servants at the gates, *that there should no Burden be brought in*.

Now I think, in all reason, you ought to have given some tolerable answer to these allegations, or else not tell us *Rep. 75.* that you have not (*you think*) *declined any thing that required a farther Reply*. These allegations seem to me (and I suppose will so to the Reader) not so weak as to be slighted. And till you have answered them, I shall not easily believe, that *Pauls preaching to them at Troas on the first day of the week, and continuing his speech till midnight*, is to be understood of *Saturday night* he being to depart on *Sunday morning*.

But since the whole stress is laid upon *The Evening and Morning were the first day*, we'll consider that a while.

I will not quarrel with you for calling it the *First day*, though you know that both *echad* in the Hebrew, and *μία* in the Greek, do signify *One* in English, (not *the First*.) For though *One* while it is alone

(and so considered) be, in propriety of speech, no more *the first* than the *last*, (for *first* is a Relative word, and there can be no *Relate* without a *Correlate*;) yet if what was *then* but *One*, be considered with respect to what then *was to be*, and since *hath been*, it may (so considered) be called *the First*. Nor would I have quarrelled with you if (instead of *first*) you had called it *One day* (as it is both in the Hebrew and in the Greek) provided, by *one day*, you do not mean (indefinitely) *some one day* (as if instead of *via* it had been *in*) but *One certain (Definite) day*; that day which, when there should be another, will become the *First* (as had been in the time when *Moses Wrote*, though not on the day whereof *Spake*;) for whether you call it *One day* (as then it was) or *the first day* (as it was to be when there came a Second) is all one to me; for 'tis the same thing either way.

Nor will I quarrel with you for translating it (as we do) the *Evening and the Morning Were the first day*, though you know that in the Original it is no more but *there Was Evening and there Was Morning the first day*, and it is so rendered in other Translations: But I would have you consider, that there can be no more concluded from it (however we translate it) than if it were so translated as it is in the Original.

If I then argue (at the rate you do) that though it be said *there was Evening and there was Morning the First day*, and *there was evening and there was morning the Sixth day*, yet it is not said *there was Evening and there was Morning the Seventh day*, (we do not so *Read*, nor is it so *Written*;) and if you reply (which you will not allow me to do) *we may Reasonably suppose* that it was so on the Seventh day and every day since; and I should rejoin to you (as you do *Repl. p. 27.*) *this is but Supposed, not in the Word, which Word is the Wisdome of God, and the highest Reason, or (as Rep. p. 36.) I know no Word for that, or other Ground but Conjecture, or some Rabbish Traditions*; This were to give you *your own Law*: But, if I should thus argue (and put weight upon it) I would allow *You* to call it *Trifling*, or *Shifting*, (or *Cavilling*, if you please, or by some other harder name :) For I do think, there may be *Reason to believe* what is not expressly written; and that, by *what is Written* we may judge *what is most likely to be true*, of what is not written. And, I find, you do allow your self the liberty (though you will not allow it us) to *suppose* many things which are not *Written*. And a great many of your Arguments begin with *I think* and *I suppose*.

But though I do not think fit to take this advantage, yet Mr. *Ainsworth, a learned Non Conformist* (for whose Authority you may per-

perhaps therefore have the more reverence) in his Translation of the *five Books of Moses*, thinks fit to take notice of this difference of the *seventh* day, from the *six* fore-going (as if, in his judgment, we might not safely argue from *those* to *this*,) in his Annotations on those words *be blessed it* Gen. 2. 3. (as a day of *delight and feasting*,) wherefore (saith he) this day is not described by Evening and Morning, as were the other *six*, which consisted of light and darkness; but *this all Day (or Light)* figuring out our perpetual Joys. How far the authority of this *eminently Holy and Learned Non-Conformist*, to speak in your own Language (for so I take him to have been a good man, and a learned man, notwithstanding his Non-conformity,) will sway with you, I cannot tell; but, on whatever time the other days did begin, he seems to begin the *seventh* day with *Light*, not at Sun-set when Night was coming-on.

Yet I shall allow you (though it be not *Written*) that there was on the Seventh day (taking-in the whole 24 hours) Darkness as well as Light.

But withal, when God is said to *Rest* on the seventh day, or (as you please to render it) to *Sabbatize* on the seventh day; this I suppose, you would have to be understood not barely of a *Negative* Rest; that is, *not-Creating*; (for then he did as much Rest or Sabbatize on the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth day, and so forward;) but to include somewhat *Positive* (what ever that were) on this day performed: And accordingly Man's Celebration of a Sabbath; in like manner: Else to *sleep* or be *idle* all the day, would be a sufficient Sanctification of the Sabbath; which I think you will not allow. Now, at *what Time* of the Seventh day, God did thus Bless and Sanctify it, by such *Positive* Sanctification, we do no more know, than at what time of the First day he said *Let there be Light*; or at what time of the Fourth day he made the *Sun*. So that we are yet in the dark, (according to this rule) at what time of the day this *Holy Rest* doth begin, if we must begin our Sabbath (as you would have it) just at such time of the day as God began his.

But I would then tell you, that *it is not Written*, (nor do we Read) in the Word, that the *Seventh* day (nor indeed any other day) doth begin at Sun-set. I am sure the *First* day did not, nor the *Second*, nor the *Third*, nor (I think) the *Fourth*; nor can you shew (in Scripture) that ever any day did so begin. I am sure, at the Pass-over, that the *Fourteenth* day did End at (or very near) *Mid-night*, and the *Fifteenth* day did then begin; not at Sun-set. And the *Sixth* day (on which Christ was Crucified) did not End at Sun-set, but a great while after. And the *First* day (on which Christ rose)

rose) did neither Begin, nor End, at Sun-set. And when you can shew me, so plainly, that ever any day (in Scripture) did so Begin or End, it will then be time to give you a further Answer.

But when you tell us *Rep. p. 69.* that *Evening and Morning did constitute and make up every day in the week*, pray what do you think of *Noon*? was that no part of the day? or, did it continue *Morning till Sun-set*? Pray shew me some *Word* where it is so *Written* or where I may *Read* it; or must we take your *Word* for it? That *Morning* begins *early while it is yet dark* I knew; but that it continues *Morning till Sun-set* I did not know. If by *Evening and Morning*, you understand *Darkness and Light*, (as you now expound it *Rep. p. 25. 67.*) I am contented so to understand it (though it be not so *Written*,) and I grant that, there was *darkness* and there was *light* the first day (and so of the rest) but I do not grant that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*. You'll say perhaps that *Darkness* was before *Light*. True: (*Darkness was upon the face of the deep*, before God said *Let there be Light*, *Gen. i. 2, 3.*) But so it might be though the day began at *Midnight*. Can you tell me *How long it was dark*, before God said *Let there be Light*? Was it just *Twelve hours*? neither more nor less? as it ought to be at the *Vernal Equinox* (where you set up your Scheme *Rep. p. 72, 73.*) if the day begin at *Sun-set*. Pray shew me where I shall find that. Yet this you must shew, before you can thence prove, that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*, or just *twelve hours* before it be light. It might be *Six hours*, or not so much; for ought you or I do know, or can know. You tell us (*Rep. p. 67.*) *You do not know at what time of the fourth day God created the Sun*: and we do as little know at what time of the first day he said *Let there be Light*.

But suppose this also (that it was dark for just twelve hours, before God said *Let there be Light*) what then? Therefore, you say, *The seventh day at the creation did begin as the three first days, and the other week-days did, that is in the evening at or about sun-set and lasted 24 hours, from evening to evening*, *Rep. p. 68.* (But, that the three first days did begin at or about *Sun-set* (when as yet there was no Sun) seems to me new doctrine.) And *Rep. p. 73.* it seems (to you) demonstrable, that every day of the week began every where in the evening round the world as the Sun did set. But stay a while. Was there not a moment when God's Rest did begin *Gen. 2. 2*? And if God's Rest were to be man's Rule, was not the Sabbath then to begin? But, at whatever moment that was, if it were then *Sun-set* in one place, it was *Sun-rising* at another, and *Noon* at a third, and at a Fourth *Midnight*. (For surely it was not *sun-set* at the same

same time all the World over.) What say you to this? You say *Repl.* p. 67. *If our Sabbath did begin at the same instant that Gods first Rest did, this were a hard objection.* But why not? why should not *Mans* Rest begin when Gods did? Because (p. 69.) *this were to stamp the question.* And therefore you would not have all parts of the Earth tied up to the precise moment of Gods Resting. And p. 67. *You know no place in the Word where it is said, that every Sabbath afterward was to begin the same moment that it began in Paradise?* But did not Gods first rest begin all the World over; at the same moment that it began in Paradise? Well: But if not so, How then? *The Sabbath then did (you say) and was afterward to begin in the evening every where.* Pray, shew me where I shall find that place in the Word, where it is said so.

You tell us indeed, *Rep.* p. 67, 68. (as a Reply to one of my Expedients,) that we may suppose the Sun when set in the Firmament, *Gen.* 1. 17. travelled westward round the earth daily, as it still doth. (Content.) And as the posterity of Adam (and so of Noah) travelled East, West, North or South, (not west-ward onely,) by degrees the Earth was overspread (very good;) and into whatever country they came as the Sun did set, so every day of the week began (that is, you tell us so) and so on to this day; and (as p. 72.) in all places of the Earth, as the Sun sets every where, so every where the Sabbath-day as every other day of the week doth there begin and end, notwithstanding the difference of hours and minutes from the setting of the Sun at Jerusalem. But this doth not answer what I urged, but confirms my Argument, and makes it out. For according to your Scheme there (at p. 72, 73.) when you set out (in your imagination) and begin to reckon from Jerusalem (west-ward) and follow the Sun as it goes round the Earth, till it comes about to Jerusalem again (and keep pace with it, in your imagination all the way, or so reckon as if you did,) the same day (you tell us) begins at Rome, 2 hours later than at Jerusalem; at London, 3 hours and twelve minutes; at New England, 8 hours; and (still following the Sun from Jerusalem to Japan,) it sets at Japan 17 hours later than at Jerusalem; and in 7 hours more, from Japan to Jerusalem again; 17 and 7 being 24. That is, when you come back to Jerusalem, it will be still the same day (for the Sun hath not set, to you, all the way, who have travelled with it all the while, in your imagination, and kept pace with it,) but 24 hours later than when you set forth. That is, your seventh day continues on, when, to those whom you left behind, it is the first day (for, to those, the Sun had set in the mean time, though not to you who travelled with it.) And, if you then

continue

continue there, *your seventh day* must be thenceforth concurrent with *their first day*: Which is the *Expedient* I offered you. And 'tis just the same case with that of Sir Francis Drake's *loosing a day* by sailing round the Earth; save that he lost the day by *parcels*, and you *all at once* (because your Imagination keeps pace with the Sun, but he could not sail so fast.) And though this day (by this means) become *longer by 24 hours* than another day; this alters not the case at all according to your doctrine; for so you tell us *Enq. p. 39. One long day in Joshuah's time, and another in Hezekiah's time, or the variety of the times of the Sun's setting in different Climates does no way disturb, for that a day longer or shorter than another by some hours is still a day, and but a day*: And so here, *Rep. p. 69. the two long days in Joshuah's and Hezekiah's time make no alteration.* And if it be lost by parcels, (which is the case of Sir Francis Drake) 'tis the same thing, for he will certainly have *one Sun-set fewer* than those he left behind, and so (if at every Sun-set where-ever you are, without considering what day it is at *Paradise* or *Jerusalem*, must begin a new day, and not till then, which is your doctrine,) *his Seventh day* (when he comes round) will be concurrent with *their first day* who stay'd behind, and so for ever after, which is the *Expedient* I offered you. Again, what you feared, *Repl. p. 66. that Christians in Turkey must keep this Sabbath on Fryday*: This will be unavoidably so, by your doctrine, to those who shall travel *Eastward* to *Japan* or the *East Indies*, and come round by the Streights of *Magellan*; for, as the other *lose a day*, these will *get a day*; and since you allow that the posterity of *Adam* or *Noah* may travel *Westward* as well as *Eastward* round the World; Their *Saturday* who thus travel *Eastward* will (when they come round) be coincident with the *Fryday* of those who stay'd behind, according to your *Scheme*.

In the mean time; The *first day* did certainly begin at the *same moment* as to all the World; (the first moment wherein God began to create.) And if it began at once for all the World, it must (after 24 hours according to your reckoning *Rep. p. 68.*) End at once for all the World. And so the second, third, sixth day accordingly. Now if the sixth day do at once end all the World over, but the seventh day not then begin (but some hours after, be it 10, 11, or 23 hours, according to your *Scheme p. 72, 73.*) then (as you argue *p. 68.*) we *lose so many hours*; which being no part of the sixth day, nor (to such) any part of the seventh day, would cease (to them) to be any part of the week. How you will answer your own Argument I cannot tell: it seems to me somewhat difficult.

If,

If, to avoid this, you will say (and 'tis the fairest you can offer, and may perhaps be true) that, When God said, *Let there be light*, it was not presently light *all the World over*; but rather that God did then create a *Body of Light* (or a *Lightsome Body*) which did move round the Earth (as now the Sun doth,) and was to be seen successively at several places, one, two, ten, twelve or twenty hours after the darkness first began: If so; this destroys your first Hypothesis, that the First day did begin every where just twelve hours before it began to be light, that is, (as you phrase it) just at *Sun-set*, (before there was a Sun.)

But pray Sir consider, How unsafe arguing it is, to catch at a notion, or take up a fancy, and then run away with it, as if all were safe, because you so fancy; and force all other places (though never so contrary) to comply with this Fancy. All you have here to lay hold of, is no more but this, *There was Evening and there was Morning the first day*, that is, there was Darkness and there was Light the first day; and *Darkness was before Light*. Whence you conclude therefore *the first day did begin at Sun-set*. Might not all this be if it begin at Midnight (or at any other dark hour) as well as at *Sun-set*? or (for so I am willing to understand you, that it may look like sense,) just twelve hours (every where) before it (there) began to be light? I should think that you might as well conclude (from your premisses) that the day is to begin at *Noon*. For, that *Morning* may continue till *Noon*, I can allow you (though not till *Sun-set*;) and you can allow (to serve a turn) *Repl. p. 29.* that *Evening* may begin *presently after Mid-day*, (rather then the *Pas-over* should not be all dispatch'd by *Sun-set*;) And then from the *beginning of Evening* to the *end of Morning* must (by this Account) be *from Noon to Noon*.

Nor is any stress to be laid upon the order of words, (that *Evening* is named before *Morning*, or *Night* before *Day*;) for both are used promiscuously in Scripture, sometime *Night* before *Day*, and sometime *Day* before *Night*. *Psal. 1. 1, 2. Blessed is the man—whose delight is in the Law of the Lord, and he meditateth therein Day and Night*; and in many other places. And if you look no further than the *Fourth day*; *Gen. 1. God said, Let there be lights in the Firmament—to divide the day from the night, (or between the day and between the night,) ver. 14. And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the Day, and the lesser light to rule the Night, ver. 16.—to rule over the Day and over the Night, and to divide the Light from the Darkness, ver. 18.* (There, we have *Day* before *Night*, and *Light* before *Darkness*.) So in *Exod. 29. 38, 39. Now*

this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year, day by day, continually, the one lamb thou shalt offer in the Morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at Even. And in like manner Numb. 28. 3, 4. This is the offering made by fire which ye shall offer unto the Lord; two lambs of the first year without spot day by day for a continual burnt-offering: the one lamb shalt thou offer in the Morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at Even: which for the Sabbath-day was to be doubled, ver. 9. 10. Where you see that (in both places) the Morning is put before the Evening. Though you are pleas'd (as to both places) to invert the order, Eng. p. 84. (but whether or no it were an Artifice I cannot tell) Their daily precise times, of Evening and Morning worship (say you) I know not, but onely Evening and Morning, Exod. 29. 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, Numb. 28. 4, 8. (Where also you put Evening and Morning in a different character, as more remarkable.) And so p. 83. Evening and Morning worship, — which Evening and Morning worship — is not to be intermitted upon the Sabbath-day: and for this see Numb. 28. 3, 4, 8, 9. You may observe also that (even for the Sabbath) the Evening Sacrifice is in the end of the day (after the Morning Sacrifice,) not over-night (in the Evening before,) so that the Morning of the Sabbath was before the Evening of the Sabbath. I forbear to cite other places where Morning is put before Evening: But these two I thought fit to mention to Rectify your Inverting the order of the Words; putting the Evening and Morning worship instead of Morning and Evening, as it is in the Texts you cite.

And 'tis very weak to lay any strength meerly on the order of words in such a case. In Gen. 2. 4. These are the generations of the Heavens and of the Earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord made the Earth and the Heavens: Which of these shall we here conclude to be first made?

I have now done with this Digression (about what time the day is to begin); which you put us upon, hoping thereby to shift off this place of Act. 20. 7. from Sunday to Saturday-night.

A like place (I said Disc. p. 38.) is that of 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. But what likeness there is between these places you cannot see Repl. p. 37. I'll shew you. I had there said, that in some places, though single instances, there is intimation of a frequent usage; as Act. 20. 7. — and a like place is that of 1 Cor. 16. This likeness there is. That such intimation was in the former place, I had shewed before. And it is so here, Now concerning the Collection for the Saints, as I have given order in the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye: Upon the first day of the

the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him; that there be no gathering when I come. Where it plainly appears, that the first day of the week, was wont to be observed both in the Churches of Galatia, and at Corinth. This the Apostle supposeth, when he directs what he would have done on those days; which is a work of charity, proper for such a day. Here *μία σάββατον* troubles you again, whether it may not be any day of the week as well as the first day of the week. I told you then Disc. p. 39. I did believe, your self thought it to be the First day. It is *ἡ μία σάββατον* (on that day which is one day after the Sabbath.) And you now confess *Repl. p. 28.* You think that in the New Testament (and where else doth it not?) it is Generally meant the First day; and the First day is Certainly meant in some places. And this concession shall serve my turn, till you can shew some place (either in the New Testament or else-where) in which it signifies otherwise; or, why it should not here so signify as every where else it doth. You then intimate *Eng. p. 58.* and again *Rep. p. 37.* as if it might be meant of a yearly Collection, because that (in pursuance I suppose of this direction) it is said in the second Epistle, 2 Cor. 3. 10. They had begun before, not onely to do, but to be forward; a year ago; And 2 Cor. 9. 1, 2. I boasted of you to them of Macedonia that Achaia (where Corinth stood) was ready a year ago. But why must this be a yearly collection rather than a weekly collection? might they not, a year ago, begin and be forward in such weekly collections? Yet you do confess *Eng. p. 58.* that, of yearly collections, nothing that you know is there expressly written. But, whether Weekly or Annual, if it were to be done on the first day of the week, 'tis manifest that the first day of the week was then observed.

But further to satisfy you that it is not an Annual, but a Weekly Collection; you may consider the words *ἡ μία σάββατον*, just in the same form with that *Act. 2. 46.* they continued in the temple *ἡ μία σάββατον* daily, every day, or day by day; and breaking bread *ἡ μία σάββατον* (domesticatim) from house to house; and ver. 47. and the Lord added to the Church *ἡ μία σάββατον* daily, such as should be saved. And to the same purpose *Act. 5. 42.* *ἡ μία σάββατον* in the Temple, *ἡ μία σάββατον* and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ. And in the Lords Prayer *Luk. 11. 3.* Give us our daily bread *ἡ μία σάββατον* day by day: And *Act. 13. 27.* the voices of the Prophets which are read *ἡ μία σάββατον* every Sabbath-day; and *Act. 14. 23.* they ordained elders *ἡ μία σάββατον* in every Church; *Act. 15. 21.* Moses of old hath them that preach him *ἡ μία σάββατον* in every City, being read in the synagogues *ἡ μία σάββατον* every Sabbath.

bath-day; and *Act. 17. 17.* $\kappa^{\rho} \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ *daily, or every day*; and *Act. 18. 4.* $\kappa^{\rho} \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ *every sabbath*; and *Act. 19. 9.* *disputing in the school of one Tyrannus $\kappa\alpha\theta' \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ daily, or day by day*; (the same with $\kappa^{\rho} \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ *Act. 17. 17.*) and *Tit. 1. 5.* *ordain elders $\kappa^{\rho} \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\upsilon$ in every city*: So here, $\kappa^{\rho} \mu\iota\alpha\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, is *on every first day of the week*, (week by week.) Would you have it to be rendered, *on every One day of the week*? And if it were to be done (on that day) *week by week*, then was this *first day*, not onely observed, but *wont to be observed*. Which shews this (as was noted before) not onely to be a *single precedent*, but a *wonted custome*; both in the Church of *Corinth*, and those in *Galatia*.

You add *Rep. p. 37.* *If weekly observed, and wont to be observed, (which you do not deny, though you are loth to grant it,) yet it is not said to be observed as a Sabbath, or as a weekly day of holy Rest. But if hence it appear that it was wont to be observed, (which is not denied,) how it was observed, will appear elsewhere, in religious exercises, of which a charitable collection for the Saints. (in want) is one. As they had, before, been forward; so he doth here exhort them (2. Cor. 9.) to Continue, and to do it Bountifully; for 'twas a thing to be done more than once; and that first day more than Once to be celebrated.*

But it could not (you say) be a Sabbath or Weekly rest, but the quite contrary, for it includes casting up their accounts, telling their money, reckoning their Stock &c. else how can they discreetly lay aside, *As God hath prospered them?* *Enq. p. 59. Rep. p. 37.* Now because I am here blamed for calling this a *Wise Objection*, I will call it so no more. But you may find it fully answered *Disc. p. 39.* (though you please to take no notice of it.) And that the same objection lies as well against *Deut. 16. 10.* where *on the Feast of Pentecost* (which you self call a Sabbath) they are to bring a tribute of a freewill-offering—according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee. Must they therefore on that day *cast up their accounts, tell their money, &c.* because they were to offer according as the Lord had blessed them? I think not; no more than upon a Sabbath-day. For that day was to be observed as such, *Levit. 23. 21.* *Ye shall proclaim on the self-same day that it may be a Holy Convocation unto you, ye shall do no servile work therein*: And it is a branch of the general order, *ver. 2.* and *ver. 4.* concerning all the Feasts there named, that they were to be proclaimed to be *Holy Convocations*: Of which the Sabbath is one *ver. 3.* and this of Pentecost another, *ver. 15, 16, 21.* If it were not then inconsistent with the (Sabbatical) feast of Pentecost, to offer according as the Lord had blessed them; why should it be thought inconsistent.

sistent with a *Religious Observance*, of the *First day of the Week*, at *Corinth* or in *Galatia*, to lay by as *God hath prospered them*; without casting up their accounts, telling their money, examining their stock, computing their expenses &c? All which may as well be done before (if need be) in the one case as in the other. As to what you say, this *laying by him in store* might be done *when they were asunder and at home*, and not a publick collection. Be it so; but if this be recommended to be done *on the First day of the week*, (whether publick or private) it is a sign the day however was observed, and presumed to be so. But you might have seen *ver. 1.* it was a *Collection* for the *Saints* (not a private laying aside) and *ver. 2.* that *there be no Gatherings when I come*, which yet must have been if (before) they onely laid aside in private.

I have now shewed you *Five precedents*, of the *First day of the week* then observed; and some of them are more than single precedents: (and cleared them from all your Objections.) The first is that of *Christ* himself, with the *two Disciples* at *Emmaus*, and then with the *Eleven* at *Jerusalem*, on the *day of his Resurrection*; and a great deal of serious business there dispatched. A second, of *Christ* also with his *Disciples*, on the *same day* the next week, and in like manner employed. A third, on the *day of Pentecost*, in the *Miraculous Effusion of the Holy-Ghost*; and *Peter's* preaching, to a great Assembly, converting *three thousand Souls*. A fourth is that of *Paul* at *Troas*, *Act. 20.* Preaching to a large congregation, and Celebrating the *Lords Supper*, on the *first day of the week*. A fifth is that of *1 Cor. 16.* where *Paul* (presuming or taking for granted that such were) directs farther, what (amongst other things) he would have to be done at those Meetings, on that *day*. But if, after all this, you cannot believe (or will not believe) that the *first day of the week*, was generally observed, or wont to be observed, or at all observed (as you tell us *Rep. p. 38.*) I cannot help it. If you could shew but half so much evidence (or even less than so) from matter of fact, for *Mans* observing the *Seventh-day-sabbath* (after *God's resting Gen. 2.*) before that of *Exod. 16.* (after *Israel's* coming out *Egypt*), for more than *two thousand and five hundred years*: you would think that *matter of fact* to be well proved.

If the Reader shall think it irksome, that I am put upon disputing so many *Little things* (I must not call them *Trifles*) I cannot help it: For, how *little* soever they are, you think them to be great matters.

A Sixth precedent is that *Rev. i. 10. I was in the Spirit on the Lords day.* Where though we have it by a new Name, it is the same day with what is otherwise called the *first day of the Week*; and hath always been so reputed.

This you do not deny to be a good Precedent, if this *Lords day* were the *first day of the Week*.

Now that it was so, (not, as you would have it, the Seventh-day-Sabbath,) I proved to you so fully, *Disc. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50.* as would satisfy any person not strongly pre-engaged. That it was the proper name of a day (by which it then was known) you grant *Rep. 39.* And that it was not the *Seventh-day-sabbath* (but some day contradistinguished from it) seems plain, else he would have called it the *sabbath* (the most known name of that day if there were no other Sabbath) *I was in the Spirit on the Sabbath day.* Ignatius who was a Disciple of St. John (and so most likely to know his meaning) who wrote soon after (if not before) St. John wrote the Revelations (for he died within ten years after it) tells us it was the *first day*, in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath (*non amplius Sabbatizantes, sed secundum Dominicam viventes, seu vitam agentes, in qua & vita nostra orta est;*) not any longer observing the Jews Sabbath, but the *Lords-Day* on which Christ our Life rose again. Exhorting the Christians not to Judaize (*Si enim usque nunc secundum Judaisimum vivimus, confitemur gratiam non recepisse*) For if we do yet Judaize, we renounce Grace. And Polycarp (another of St. John's disciples) was of the same mind with Ignatius, who collected and published the Epistles of Ignatius, with one of his own. And Justin Martyr (who was Contemporary with them, though not a Christian till some time after) makes it to be our *Sunday*. Yet these were none of the *Romish World* (as you speak *Rep. 59.*) but *Greek Fathers*, and older than the *Romish Corruptions*; or the *Romish Usurpations*, (though not older than the Church of the Romans to whom St. Paul wrote;) For that *Headship of Rome*, you tell us *Eng. p. 129.* seems not assumed in divers Centuries after the Second Century. And therefore this, not originally from the Romanists (as you fancy *Eng. p. 5.*) nor did they take it from what you call *Romish Traditions*. And it is so taken in the Fathers, Councils, and Church History all along to this day. To which your Answer is, These are but Traditions, there is or can be no certainty from them; *Rep. p. 39, 40.* (So that all History is but Tradition.) But pray how shall we know that Rome mentioned in the *New Testament* is the same with what we now call Rome (and which hath been so called ever since) otherwise than by such Tradition? And how can you tell whether our *Satur-day*

day or Sunday be the same days (in a continued Succession of Jewish Weeks) with what they called the *seventh* and *first* days, otherwise than by *Tradition*? and (which is more) *Unwritten Tradition*? You tell us *Rep. p. 3.* *All the Christian and Hebrew Churches in the world are agreed that Sunday is the First day of the Week* (meaning, I suppose, of the Jewish Week;) Now is this any other than *Tradition*? even *Unwritten Tradition*? And you had told us before, *Eng. p. 78.* that otherwise all the Jews and Christians hitherto in the World are out in their reckoning: Which is nothing but *Tradition*; which you despise. And *pag. 93.* that (in the fifth Century) *All Christians in the world did agree which was the Sabbath-day* (meaning, the Jewish Sabbath) and *which the first day of the week* (but it was by a *common Tradition* they did so agree;) And you add, *they all agreed to call the Seventh day of the Week the Sabbath day* (meaning the Jewish Sabbath) but you should have added also, and to call the *first day of the Week, the Lords-day*: But it was by *equal Tradition*; they did so agree. And by like tradition (from the fifth Century downwards till now) we so reckon to this day; but still it is but *Tradition*. And if (as you tell us *Rep. 39, 40.*) *there be no certainty in such Traditions*, then are we not certain of either; but, if there be, then are we equally certain of both. And when you tell us *Rep. p. 10.* *they were taught it down along from Adam in gracious families from Father to Son*; (which was the Seventh-day in course from the Creation): If this were so (which I can hardly believe) yet still this is *Tradition*, and no more. And what you add *Rep. p. 74.* that *the certain Seventh-day* (in course from the first creation,) *was preserved by all Nations, Worshiping the Sun upon Sunday*: is so weak, that there is not the least footstep in History, Sacred or Profane (that I can find) that any nation (much less all nations) did Worship the Sun upon Sunday more than on any other day, or that any nation (before *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*) had any *Weeks* at all; nor any after that time, but the Jews only, before the times of *Christianity*; or that the names of *Saturday, Sunday, Monday, &c.* were so much as known before that time: And if any of the *Heathen* had any *Weeks* before that time, how shall we know that they were in an *uninterrupted* circulation from the first Creation: So that all this is not so much as *Tradition*, but a meer *Fansy*. 'Tis true that, since *Christ's* time, upon planting the Gospel all the World over, and (with it) the Observation of the *Lords-day*, we may reasonably depend upon the *Common Tradition* (which if one Nation should mistake or forget, would soon be rectified by neighbour Nations) but when (by your own concessions) no other Nation

tion in the World did observe the Jewish Sabbath (nor, that we know of, any Week at all,) the case is far otherwife. Nor is it any where said in Scripture, that the Jewish Sabbath (from the first raining of *Manna*) was a *Seventh* day in course from the Creation.

I remember, you tell us *Enq.* p. 117, 118. and you mind me of it *Rep.* p. 40, 75. that *I say nothing to it* (being, it seems, a thing on which you lay great weight,) that *in the Records of Parliament and of the Courts at Westminster, Saturday is called Sabbati, or dies Sabbati (the Sabbath-day.)* True, (as supposing, by Tradition, this day of our week to be what the Jews called the Sabbath in their week.) But do not you know also, that (in the same Records) *Sunday is called (Dies Dominicus) the Lord's-day?* And if those prove *Saturday* to be the Jewish Sabbath, why should not these as well prove *Sunday* to be the *Lord's-day*? All the difference is, as to that you were Quick-sighted, but Blind as to this. You may observe also (if that may be thought material) that the one is *Sabbati* or *dies Sabbati* (in the Genitive case, in the same form with *dies Saturni*, and as the other days are,) but the *Lord's-day* is *dies Dominicus* (in the Ablative) meaning (I suppose) that *Saturday* is the day on which *had been* the Jewish Sabbath; but this, the day *which is* the *Lord's-day*. Which different Construction seems plainly to intend (in our Law) a different import of the words. By *dies Saturni*, or *dies Lune*, we do not mean, a day *Instituted* by *Saturn* or the *Moon*, as by *dies Dominicus* we do mean, the day *Instituted* by our Lord, (like as by *Cæna Dominica*, we mean, the Supper *Instituted* by our Lord.) So that these *Records* do you no service at all, but Dis-service.

You tell us *Enq.* p. 64. that *the Seventh-day-sabbath was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by him was blessed and sanctified; and that day which the Lord blessed and sanctified is the Lord's day; That he that blessed it was the Lord Christ; And p. 65. The Seventh-day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God Exod. 20. and Deut. 5. and that which is the Lords-Sabbath is the Lords-day. That If. 58. the Lord calls it my holy-day; and it cannot be the less his day because it is his Holy-day; and if it be His day it is the Lords-day. And p. 66. that the Son of Man (the Lord Jesus Christ) is Lord of the Sabbath-day; and that day whereof Christ is Lord, is the Lords-day. And p. 67. Christ, who gave the Sabbath was and is Lord of it. And p. 68. Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, who gave it, perfectly understood his Own Law. And to the same purpose Rep. p. 39, 40. and elsewhere.*

Now this puts us upon another Digression (which may take us up some time) In what consideration our Lord Jesus Christ may be

said

aid to have Created the World, to have Rested the Seventh day and blessed it, to have given the Law upon Mount Sinai, and the like.

You may remember that I did formerly distinguish between what Christ did as God (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) and what he did (separately) as our Lord Jesus Christ (God and Man, as our Mediator, and Founder of the Christian Religion;) and that the Lord our God in the Old Testament, doth not signify just the same as our Lord Jesus Christ in the New Testament. And I told you Disc. p. 2, 3. I do agree, that our Lord Jesus Christ (according to his Divinity) is God, the true God, the God that made Heaven and Earth, the God who delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai: But I cannot agree that Christ as God and Man (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy-Ghost) did these things; For he was not then Man.

Now this you take heinously Rep. p. 4. (that I should thus distinguish) and you think the Doctor blamable, for so distinguishing. And why so? Are we not to distinguish between what Christ doth as God, (in common with the Father and Holy-Ghost) and what he doth as Mediator, God and Man? Yes. Where then is the fault? May not I speak Distinctly (to avoid mistakes) because you had spoken suspiciously? It insinuates (you say) as if you had said, that Christ as God and Man did all those things: (If your own words do not so insinuate, I did not; nor said any such thing:) whereas you neither said nor ever thought, that Christ was incarnate at the making of the World, or at his giving the Law at Mount Sinai: (Why his giving the Law, rather than Gods giving the Law?) So as the Doctor hath not well furnished in this. And again, Neither I nor any other that I know (say you) has said or thought that Christ when He blessed the Seventh day (Why when He blessed, rather than, when God blessed?) was then in the Flesh, so that in this I think the Doctor blamable. And yet a third time, p. 5. For the Doctor to impose upon his Reader herein as he doth (you say) seems blamable: and such Artifices (you say) the Reader may discern afterwards. And I pray, why all this? Did I charge you with having said or thought that Christ was incarnate at God's making of the World, or at God's giving the Law at Sinai? I believe that (when you consider of it) you do not think he was: But if your language were inconsiderate, that was not my fault. I only explained in what sense I can agree to what you said (that our Lord Jesus made the World, and gave the Law upon Mount Sinai.) If your sense be the same with mine, why do you quarrel with my speaking plainly, what you meant? If it be not the same, 'tis You be blamable, not I. You might as well (without all this sourness) have said You meant no more, but as I do.

But the Doctor (you say p. 5.) herein seems to follow Mr. Tross. If so; I know no hurt in it. But 'tis your mistake; For what I say there, was written (and printed too) a good while before I had seen Mr. Tross's book, or knew any thing of it. For though Mr. Tross's book came out, a little before mine was quite finished; the greatest part of mine was printed before his came out. And if Mr. Tross have pressed this more closely upon you than I have done: You must blame your self for it; when all along you take pleasure to attribute to our Lord Jesus Christ (as if with that Reduplication,) which was more properly to be said of God indefinitely. If I (because the Holy-Ghost is God) should affect to say, *In the beginning the Holy Ghost created the Heavens and the Earth*; and, *The Holy-Ghost said, Let there be Light*; and, *The Holy-Ghost said, Let us make Man after our image*; and, *The Holy Ghost rested the seventh-day*; and, *The Holy-Ghost said, I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other God but me*; (as if no Person but the Holy Ghost might be owned for God;) Would not this look like an odd Affectation? Yet at this rate you speak all along, affecting to say *Our Lord Jesus Christ* where it were more proper to say *God*. Thus here, The Sabbath-day was instituted by *our Lord Jesus Christ*; and by *him blessed*. He that blessed it was *the Lord Christ*; and the like. Whereas this was not done by him *singly*, nor by him *as Christ*, but by him *as God*, and *jointly* with the Father and Holy-Ghost. And to what purpose is it said, *He that blessed it was the Lord Christ*? when this adds no new authority to the Law more than if it had been said *God blessed it* (Father, Son and Holy-Ghost;) for we are no more to break the *Law of God*, than the *Law of our Lord Jesus Christ*. And though you sometimes admit *the Father and Holy-Ghost* as staters herein; yet you say, 'tis *Eminently Christ* Enq. p. 11. And *Christ you understand as Principal Efficient of all things in Heaven and Earth, to whom the Creation is Eminently and Particularly ascribed*; and (you think) *Eminently spoken of Christ*, p. 6. and again, (in the same page) you do not exclude (you say) *the Father from this work, nor the Holy-Ghost*; but say it is *Eminently ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ*, p. 6. and they *Specially point at Christ* p. 12. and *the Commands given by Christ the Mediator*, p. 13. and *the God of Israel who gave the Law was and is Jehovah the Son*, p. 13.

Now I can allow it proper enough to say that *Christ* (as to his Divinity) is *the God who made the World* (for Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the same God,) but it seems hard to say (conversely) that *the Father, Son and Holy Ghost* (who jointly made the World) are *Jehovah the Son*. The Father, Son and Holy-Ghost made the World; there

therefore *He that made the World* (suppose the Father, or Holy-Ghost) is the Lord Jesus Christ, will not follow; but onely that *One of those who* (jointly) *made the World is the Lord Jesus Christ.*

I thought you might have learned so much Grammar at School, as to know that *plurality* doth not signify *one of the Sabbaths*; and so much Logic at the University as to know that an *Universal Affirmative* is not to be Converted *simpliciter*; as well as so much Law at Westminster, as to know that (in the Records of Parliament) *dies Dominicus*, or the Lord's-day, commonly called Sunday, doth not signify Saturday; and that a *midnight-day* (as you wittily call it) that is, *from midnight to midnight*, is no Absurdity, but good Law in Westminster-hall. I am told that in Rome and Italy they do reckon as you would have it, from Sunset to Sunset; beginning, from Sunset to reckon, *One, Two, Three a-clock*; and so onward to *Four and Twenty a-clock* at Sunset the next day, (so that *mid day* is, with them, sometimes *sixteen a-clock*, and sometimes *twenty a-clock*, according as the days be long or short;) and I think it is *there* onely that men do so reckon. Should I now Reproach your way of reckoning, (from Sunset to Sunset) as *Romish, Popish, Monkish, Romish Tradition*, the *Romish World*, the *Men of Rome*, *Rome and its followers*? You own that *Heathenish Rome* in our Saviours time, (as well as *Christian England* now) did reckon from Midnight to Midnight; and it was not, till *some ages* after, that *Popish, Monkish, Anti-christian Rome* did assume this (*Jewish*) Reckoning: And would you not think it a doughty Argument if I should thus argue against your *Evening-day*? But I go on.

They seem (you say) *Especially to refer to Jehovah the Son* p. 14. *We have here the Lord Jesus Christ who made the World, resting on the Seventh day, blessing and sanctifying of it, that is giving the Institution of it, &c.* p. 23. (and why not as well, God who made the World, &c.) and this recorded for the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, (why not as well, for the glory of God?) and again (in the same page) *the Lord Jesus Christ made the World* (and did not God the Father as well?) *He rested on the seventh day, He sanctified it, and so instituted it, and to this institution you think do refer the words of our Lord, The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath; He instituted it &c.* What? He more than the Father and Holy-Ghost? Or did he, as *Son of Man*, institute it? I do not think; (though it seems you do) that these words refer to the *Son of Man's Institution*, but rather to his power of *Abolition* of the Jewish Sabbath (which was soon after to follow;) For they are spoken by way of *Derogation* not of *Confirmation* of it. Again, *The Ten Commandments were spoken by*

Christ Eminently p. 24. After the promulgation of the Law by Christ at Mount Sinai p. 26. That Christ spake the Ten Commandments p. 29. The Lord rested in heaven and his body in the grave upon His Own Instituted Seventh day p. 42. He (Mr. Chasie) though you hope he was a very Good, as well as a Learned man, seems (you say) not to have had clear Apprehensions of Christ, as Creating the world; and then Resting; nor of Christ as Instituting the Sabbath Gen. 2. 2, 3. nor of Christ's confirming the Moral Law at Sinai, Exod. 20. p. 63. (Yet, I presume, he had clear apprehensions of his being God all that time.) So p. 67. Christ who gave the Sabbath, and p. 78. Christ who gave it. The Seventh day which Christ rested upon after the Creation. p. 75. The Seventh day (in the heart of the fourth commandment) is secured by Christ, p. 77. The first Sabbath Gen. 2. ordained by Christ p. 77. Obedience to Christ's ten commandments p. 81. Conformity to the Laws of Christ, that is the Ten Commandments, p. 81. To Christ's laws, that is, to the ten Commandments p. 82. The law our Lord hath given us in the ten commandments, p. 82. That authority which first commanded it, which was Our Lord himself p. 85. Who but Christ hath power to institute a Sabbath-day? p. 86. Who is bound to observe a day not instituted by Christ in scripture? or to lay aside what He hath there Instituted? p. 86. One of Christ's commands p. 91. Christ can vindicate His commandments p. 113. The world was made by our Lord Jesus Christ p. 136. He is the Lord Jehovab who after the Creation instituted the Seventh day, rested on it, sanctified and blessed it. p. 196. At Mount Sinai the Commands were given by Christ the Redeemer, to Jews and Gentiles. p. 137.

Now when, in all these places (and many more) it were more proper to say God indefinitely, than the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet you affect all along to apply the Creation of the World, the Institution of the Sabbath, the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai, singly to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to him as our Mediator, and our Redeemer, and to him Eminently and Especially (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy Ghost;) I had reason to say (Disc. p. 3.) you seemed to lay great stress upon it (at which Rep. p. 4. you are offended) else why should you affect all along to speak where there was no reason for it, and where the word God would have served your turn as well? I see no reason (as you speak Rep. p. 5.) why you should (affect to) vary from the Scriptures Expressions.

Nor do I see any cause why you should be so highly offended, that I should (without any reflection upon you) Explain what I meant, and what I hoped you had meant (or should have meant) though your Expressions were justly exceptionable.

I add

I add further; Though you now tell us, *You did not say nor think that Christ was incarnate at the making of the World* (and I believe, when you consider of it, you do not think he was); yet you do not retract your saying, That *Our Lord Jesus Christ* did, as our *Mediator and Redeemer*, create the World &c, and that (as such) he did it *Eminently and Especially* (in contradistinction to the Father and Holy-Ghost) and that *Jehovah who made the World, is the Lord Jesus Christ*. Which I do not think to be safe expressions.

Nor have you any reason to charge me (as *Rep. p. 5.*) with *Insinuations* against the *Deity of Christ*: (And I presume you do not suspect me as to that point, whatever you please here to insinuate.) Shall I return you your own words which there follow, *Why you should thus begin in a case which relates to the Deity of Christ with such insinuations* (as if I would derogate from it) for which you have no colour from my Discourse, unless it were to infuse some Prejudice, *I am not willing to conjecture*? Must all be thought enemies to the *Deity of Christ*, who do not approve of your *Saturday-sabbath*?

I do own that the *Divine Person* called in Scripture *the Son of God*, (or *God the Son*) was from all Eternity with God and was God (and is God) and did (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) *make the World*; and that the same *Divine Person* (remaining the same Person) was (afterwards) *incarnate*, and did (as God and Man) become our *Mediator and Redeemer*, and (as such) is commonly designed by the title of *our Lord Jesus Christ*; But I do not know that as such he made the World, (for there is one *Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5.) Nor do I know that he did enter upon the *Execution* of his *Mediatory Office*, or the *work of Redemption*, before he was the *Seed of the Woman*, that is, before he became *Man*. 'Tis true it was before *Designed*, and by God *Decreed*, and the *Effect* of it did look backward to those before Christ; but the *Execution* (of what was before decreed) was after he became *Man*; not before the *Creation of the World*. And what you allege from *Eph. 1. 2, 3, 4.* *the Father hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world*, is nothing to the purpose; for though we were chosen before the foundation of the world to be in him, and that we should be holy, &c. yet it was not decreed that we should be before the foundation of the World, or that we should be holy before the foundation of the World: and ver. 5. *having Predestinated us to the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ*; our *Predestination* was before, but our *Adoption by Jesus Christ* was after. Nor was there any *Occasion* of such *Mediator or Redeemer* till the *Fall of Man*; but the *Creation of the World* was

(I think) before the Fall; and therefore not created by Christ as Mediator; but by that *Divine Person* (in Union with the Father and Holy-Ghost) who *afterward* became *Man*, and was our Redeemer and Mediator. And if the Creation be more *Eminently* to be ascribed to one of the three Persons rather than the other, I should choose to ascribe it to the Father (rather than *Eminently* to the Son) because in our Creed we say *I believe in God the Father Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son &c.* And we do use to distinguish between *God the Creator and Christ the Redeemer.*

Yet I did not reproach you for saying that *God who created the World* (Father Son and Holy-Ghost) is *Our Lord Jesus Christ*; (I only explained what I meant; and if you mean so too, there is no hurt in it.) As neither did I reproach you for divers other unsafe Expressions: As when you tell us *Love is the Essence of God*, Enq. p. 15. which I should not have said. I know 'tis said that *God is Love*, (1 Job. 4. 8, 16.) that is, a *Loving God*, or a *very Loving God*; and therefore I would say that *Love* is a *Divine Attribute*, or (if you will) an *Essential Attribute* (resulting from Gods Essence and inseparable from it;) and so is *Hatred and Wrath* (for God doth as well *Hate Evil* as he *Loves Good*; and is as well *Angry with Sin*, as *Pleased with Duty*;) yet I would not say that *Hatred and Wrath* are Gods *Essence*. And you tell us again (in the same page) that *Truth is Gods Essence*. I know it is said that *God is a God of Truth* Deut. 32. 4. Isai. 65. 16. (and cannot Ly,) and *The Spirit is Truth* (1 Job. 5. 6.) that is, what the Spirit testifies is *True*; Yet I would not therefore say that *Truth is Gods Essence* (though *Truth* in God be an *Essential Attribute*;) For it is said also that *God is a Jealous God*, yet I should think it a bold expression (and justly blamable) to say that *Jealousy* is Gods *Essence*. Nor would I say (as p. 30) because *God is Light and in him is no darkness*, 1 Joh. 1. 5. therefore *Light* is the *Essence* of God: For 'tis said also *Our God is a consuming fire*, Heb. 12. 29. Deut. 4. 24. yet I should think it a very unfavoury expression to say, a *consuming fire* is Gods *Essence*. We say indeed that Gods *Attributes* are not things *Really distinct* (*ut res & res*, as the Schools speak) but *Modally* at most (or rather not so much, but only *ratiōne ratiocinatus*;) yet I would not therefore say that *Love* is the *Essence* of God, or that *Hatred* is the *Essence* of God, however *Essential* to God, as inseparable from his Essence.

To return therefore from this Digression, and apply it to our present business; *The Sabbath of the Lord our God*, (who made Heaven

Heaven and Earth and rested the Seventh day) is no proof that *the Lords day* in the New Testament (that is, the day of our Lord Jesus Christ, the founder of our Christian Religion) is the *Seventh day of the Jewish Week*. For by *the Lord* (Jehovah) in the Old Testament, is meant *God* indefinitely (with joint respect to Father Son and Holy-Ghost;) but *the Lord* (*κύριος*) in the New Testament is usually meant of *Our Lord Jesus Christ* (as you cannot but know;) and *whereas we use the Cup of the Lord*, *whereas we use the Lords Table*, and *whereas we use the Lords Supper*, 1 Cor. 10. 21. 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27. are distinctly meant (and you know them so to be) of the *Cup*, the *Table*, the *Supper* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, appointed by him as the Founder of our Christian Religion; And accordingly *whereas we use* (just in the same form) *the Lords Day*, is the day of our *Lord Jesus Christ* as by him appointed. And to play upon the ambiguity of the Word *Lord* (which sometimes signifies the *Lord God*, and sometimes the *Lord Christ*) is but loose arguing, and Fallacious Disputation. Yet this is all you pretend, for proving that *κύριος* *whereas* the *Lords day* Rev. 1. 10. is the *Seventh day-sabbath* of the Jewish Week. You do not shew that any where that day was ever called *κύριος* *whereas*, or that *κύριος* *whereas* doth any where signify other than our *dies dominicus* with particular respect to our Lord Christ; nor do in your *Reply* add any new strength to your old Argument, to take off this Answer which I gave to it.

But further yet: If *κύριος* *whereas* the *Lords day*, *dies dominicus*, be the *Seventh day sabbath*, as you would have it: Why do you find fault with us for observing that day? The day which we observe (as *the Christian Sabbath*) is the *dies dominicus*, and we keep it by that name, and by that name it hath been kept from the Apostles days downward till now, and in a continual Succession from that day which is so called in Rev. 1. 10. Which, whether it be the first day or the seventh day of the Jewish Week, this is the day we keep. We think it to be the *first* day, and you say 'tis the *seventh* day, but however it is *dies dominicus*; and your *Records* (to which you appeal) do no more prove that *dies sabbati* is in a continual succession from the Jewish *sabbath*, than that *dies dominicus* (in the same *Records*) is in continual succession from the Apostles *Lords day*. If you say, We have nothing but *Tradition* for the One; You have nothing but *Tradition* for the other; for there is no man now living, that can remember either.

I should now have done with this point but that I am called upon
Rep p. 40. and again *Rep* p. 75. to answer your *Collections* for the
Seventh

Seventh day in Derogation to the *Dominical day*, as you call it.

But why must *dies Dominicus*. (for so, I presume you find it in the Latine from whence these Collections are made) be all along translated *the Dominical day*, rather than *the Lords day*? Is not *dies dominicus*, in plain English, *the Lords day*, as much as *cena dominica* is *the Lords Supper*; and *oratio dominica*, *the Lords Prayer*? I find you can say, without scruple, *the Lords Supper*, and *the Lords Prayer*, and why not as well the *Lords day*, but it must be forsooth *the Dominical day*? Would it not be thought an odd Humour in me, if I should affect all along to say *the Dominical Cene* and *the Dominical Orison* for what others in plain English call *the Lords Supper*, and *the Lords Prayer*? And why then must it be with you *the Dominical day*? Is it because you think *Dominical*, a Fincial word? Or, because you would amuse your English Reader to make him think that *the Dominical day* doth signify somewhat other than *the Lords day*? You mind me sometimes of the *Records in Parliament*; but you may remember also that what in those Records is called *dies Dominicus* in Latine is in the same Records (and Acts of Parliament) called, in English, *the Lords day commonly called Sunday*. However, I know no great hurt in the word *Dominical* (as to those that understand Latine) save that it is a needles Affeetation: And, as for those English Readers who do not understand Latine, I would tell them that *the Dominical day* is in plain English *the Lords day*, however you may please to disguise it with a hard Word.

This Collection is a work, it seems, of some years (in several times and in several places, and for divers years, Enq. p. 120. though with interruptions,) to which, you say, *the Doctor says nothing*, and to which *the Doctor answers not*. 'Tis true I did not say much to it, because I thought it not to need an Answer, and was contented to sift the Reader with it.

But since you call upon me to answer it, I have looked it over again, and though I am still of the same mind, yet I comply with you therein.

The question we are now upon, is, whether the *Dominical Day* have been all along observed; and what you have to say against it in these Collections: for shewing *When the observation of the seventh day ended, and when the observation of the first day began amongst Christians*, Enq. pag. 85. But if you admit that the observation of the Seventh day ended when that of the First day began, it must be very early.

That the *Lords day* was observed very early, not onely by St. John, Rev. 1. 10. but by his Disciple Ignatius within ten years after

after St. *John* wrote his *Revelation*, if not sooner; and by *Polycarp* another of St. *John's* disciples who collected and published the *Epistles* of *Ignatius* together with one of his own on that occasion; and by *Justin Martyr* about twenty years after; and by *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, and the *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Church History* downwards, was shewed before; and I suppose you will not deny but that there are frequent Testimonies of it; onely you would have us suppose, that all *History* is but *Tradition*. But I am now to consider your Collection. I have not examined your *Quotations* (nor think it worth the while) but take them as you give them; with your descants upon them. But those Descants I do not take to be authentick.

Your Collection begins *Enq.* p. 91. and ends *pag.* 130. (with many of your Descants intermixed.) Wherein you give us (if I do not mis-reckon) between fifty and threescore testimonies for the observation of the *Lord's day* (or, as you please to call it, the *Dominical day*), in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth Century, and so downwards. Beside which you tell us *pag.* 121. you pass by some Expressions in *History* (how many, you do not tell us) in favour of the first day, (which 'tis Candid to Confess, but Partiality so to do.) And you tell us p. 131. *He who will take the pains may find much more in Binius, the Magdeburgenses, and Eusebius.*

And these Testimonies for the *Dominical day*, (if your Dates be right) begin very Early, in the *First Century*; that is, I suppose, before St. *John's* writing the *Revelation*. Our Saviour's death was about the 34th year of that Century, and St. *John* wrote his *Revelation* about the 94th or 95th year thereof, some years before his death: for he lived till within a year or two of the end of that Century.

You tell us p. 96. That in the first Century, Contentions were stirred up about celebrating the Pass-over upon the *Dominical day*. And though *pag.* 122. you mince the matter a little by calling it about the second or third Century, yet even there you cite *Lucius*, *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. and you there own this *Dominical day* (that is, in plain English, the *Lords day*) to be the first day of the Week, not the *Jewish Sabbath*. Though elsewhere you would have it, that the *Lords day* mentioned by *John* *Rev.* 1. 10. is the seventh day Sabbath, *Enq.* p. 69. And you insist upon it *Rep.* p. 39. that the *Lords day* *Rev.* 1. 10. is not onely the name of a day, but the name of the Seventh-day Sabbath. And *Enq.* p. 69. that 'tis a Stealing-away the *Lords day* from the Seventh-day Sabbath, and giving that name to the first day: And great endeavours you use to perswade us so to think,

Eng. p. 60, to p. 69. and *Rep.* p. 3, 7, 15. 19. 39, 40. though you confess (*Eng.* p. 64.) that *from the Text or Context you find nothing very considerable* to that purpose.

Now what you call about the *second or third Century*, is (by your own citation) in the *first Century*, and in all likelihood while *St. John* was yet alive, and even before he wrote the *Revelation*.

Yet I will be just to you; *Anicetus* and *Victor* (whom you cite as concerned in this business, p. 96.) were Bishops of *Rome* in the *second Century* (not in the first;) but the dispute about it was older than so; and p. 124, 125. you cite *Pius*, to the same purpose, who was before either of those two; And p. 96. (as before) and again p. 123. you own it to have been in the *first Century*; and cite for it *Lucius*, *Cent. 1. lib. 2. fol. 36.* and again *Lucius*, *1 Cent. lib. 2. fol. 387.*

I did not expect that Mr. *Bampffield* would have furnished us with testimonies so ancient (as in the *first century*, while some of the Apostles were yet living) for the observation of *Easter*, (though with some difference about the day) and (at p. 122.) reckon *St. Paul* amongst those who so observed it.

But when you tell us *Eng.* p. 123. that some kept *Easter on the first day of the week*, others on the *fourteenth day of the first month*, in commemoration of *Christs Resurrection*; I take this to be a mistake. Those who kept it on the *first day of the Week* (on which *Christ* rose) kept it indeed in *Commemoration of the Resurrection* on that day. But not the *Quartadecimani* who kept it on the *fourteenth day of the month*, (whatever day of the week it happened to be.) For this was neither the day of the *Week*, nor the day of the *Month*, on which *Christ* rose, but on which he Died. And therefore kept it either as a *Continuation* of the *Jewish Pass-over* on that day: or as a *Commemoration* of *Christs Death*, not of his *Resurrection*. But this is beside our business, and therefore I pass it.

What you tell us *Eng.* p. 89. of the point of the *Vernal and Autumnal Equinox being just over Paradise*; I do not understand (nor, I suppose, do you) nor shall I trouble my self to make sense of it. But will excuse it, as being a thing out of your rode.

Now how soon so ever the controversy did arise about keeping *Easter* on the *Dominical day*, so soon at least the *Dominical day* was understood to be the *first day of the (Jewish) week*. And when you tell us, *Eng.* p. 93. that you transcribe these authorities, to shew that all the *Christians in the World* did agree which was (by Tradition) the *Sabbath day* and which the *First day of the Week* (you should have added, and which was the *Dominical day*) and that they all agreed, you

you say, (but it was by tradition) *to call the Seventh day of the week, the Sabbath day; you should have added, and the first day of the week, the Dominical day.* You might have observed also that all this for the Sabbath day is but (what you call) Tradition, and the same Tradition is as full for the Dominical day (the Lords day) being the First day of the week. For how came they thus to agree in the fifth Century, the time you cite? Was it not from a presumption that (from Christs time downward) by a continued Tradition from hand to hand the memory of the Seventh day (of the Jewish Week) was preserved, and the memory of the Lords day likewise? And by a like Tradition (and no otherwise) is the same memory preserved from the fifth Century to our Time.

You do not deny therefore, the Dominical day (the Lords day) to have been then observed all along, and by that name, and taken to be the same with the first day of the (Jewish) Week. Which is the thing I was to prove.

But, you tell us, p. 91. that in some places there were publick Assemblies on other days also; (And no doubt but there were; like as now there are publick Assemblies for Prayers and Sermons on week-days, and in some places every day, for those to repair to who have leisure and opportunity of so doing:) And you name the Sabbath, the Dominical day, the second and fourth of the Sabbath (which you take to be Monday and Wednesday) and Parasceven (which you take to be Good Friday, (perhaps others may take it to be every Friday) p. 92, 93, 94, 97, 99. But still you own the Dominical day was one; And then, their meeting also on some other days, doth not gain-say their observing of this day.

You tell us p. 94. and again p. 99. that amongst the days for publick assemblies the Dominical day is mostly named, (as being indeed the chief day so observed,) but amongst some (you say) the day of the Sabbath is found, (but not alone without the Lords day, or instead thereof.) And again The Dominical day was solemn to Christians, but amongst other festivals mention is made of the Sabbath: And yet again, When they did assemble, and how often, is not expressly written but the most mention is made of the Sabbath and of the Dominical day. So still the Lords-day is one, whatever other days be sometimes or somewhere observed.

You own also, p. 97. that of these two days mostly named, the Dominical day was preferred; and that, on the Sabbath day they were not to Judaize but might work, but not on the Dominical day, and this as old at least as the fourth Century, by your own citation. And many such testimonies you give us all along, of not working on the

Dominical days, but spending them in *Religious Exercises*. And own that (at least as early as the Twelfth Century) it was called *the Christian Sabbath*, p. 95. Which doth not well agree with what you have pag. 118. where you would have us think it was not so called till *by some late writers, within Eighty years or thereabout*.

You own also this difference, as high at least as the fourth Century, p. 92, 93. (though at p. 101. you would have us think *this constitution* not to be earlier than *the twelfth Century*;) between the *Dominical day* and the *Sabbath* (between the *Lords day* and *Saturday*) that *Saturday* was kept as a *Fast* (in memory of Christs lying in the Grave that day) but the *Lords day* as a *Festival* (in memory of Christs Resurrection) p. 92, 93; 94, 95, 97, 98, 101, 104, 119. But, *publick Fasting-days* (you tell us p. 93,) *were kept holy to God as well as Festivals*; and *there doth appear no great difference whether they Feast or Fast on that day*. Surely there is: *The Sabbath* (Lev. 23. 2, 3.) is to be kept as a *Feast of the Lord*; and therefore to *Fast on that day*, is not to keep *this Sabbath*. You say further, that, *some persons and in some places did not fast but dine upon this day*. That is, (if I do not misunderstand it) they did *not so much* as keep it as a *Fast*. But however, the *Lords day* was kept, and kept as a *Festival*.

Some (you tell us p. 109, 110, 111, 114.) did keep their Sabbath from *Saturday noon*, or from *Saturday three a-clock*, till *Sun-rising on Monday morning*. But this makes nothing against the *Lords day*, for that was therein observed intirely, and hedged-in on both sides.

You tell us p. 95. that *on the Sabbath day, William the Conquerour on the principal Feast had magnificent and sumptuous banquets, which they called a profanation of the Sabbath*. But which of the days (the first or the seventh) you cannot certainly say, but *Think* (you tell us) *it was the Seventh-day-sabbath*. What if I should think it were the *First-day Sabbath*; were not *My Thinking* as good authority as yours? Since you own p. 95. that, about that time, the *Lords day* was called *the Christian Sabbath*. And I doubt some other of your citations in favour of *Saturday*, may (if well examined) be found to refer to the *Sunday-sabbath*. But I do not trouble myself to examine them.

You tell us, pag. 115, 117, 118, 119, that (in England) *we have no Statute made for Sunday* (that you know of) *till that in Edward the Sixth's time*. But doth that prove the *Lords day* was not till then observed in England? (But you own the *Kings Writs*, and *Order of the Lord Mayor*, to that purpose, older than so.) Do you know

know of any Statute or Act of Parliament (before that time) made *against it*, or for *Saturday sabbath*? There was no *Imperial Law* (that we know of) older than *Constantine*, for the *exercise of the Christian Religion*; but are we therefore to think it was *not practised* before that time?

You do not find, you tell us p. 117, by the best collections you can make with your few books, that, for 1200 years or more, they (in England) received the Observation of Sunday, (However, this is long before King Edward the Sixth's time.) But in the year 1200 you own it p. 115. But do you find that, before that time, they kept their Sabbath on Saturday? No: Nor do you find, it seems, whether before that time they did keep any Sabbath at all. You say, they had a weekly day of Rest, (I suppose they had, and that it was the Lords day commonly called Sunday.) But all the old Records yet extant, even down to this day, you say, do call it (that day of rest) the Sabbath day. I do not know where to find those old records (older than the year 1200) which tell us that Saturday was their Weekly day of Rest. It may be true that in old Records (I know not whether so old) and in new ones too, Saturday is called *dies Sabbati*, and so it is at this day, (as being the supposed day of the Jewish Sabbath,) Yet, not Saturday but the Lords day is our weekly day of Rest, and was so (for ought you shew to the contrary) ever since Christianity was received amongst us. You own that, since the year 1200, the Lords day hath been received as our weekly day of Rest, and so it is at this day; though Saturday is yet called *dies Sabbati*. And when you produce those Records (older than the year 1200,) if therein you find Saturday called *dies Sabbati*, I suppose we shall there find Sunday called *dies Dominicus*.

You tell us of Markets kept on the Dominical day p. 116. in the time of King John and Henry the Third. This perhaps may prove that it was not so well observed as it ought to be; but it doth not prove it *not to be at all observed*. For this was after the year 1200, when you own the Lords day to be received. You tell us *Eng.* p. 39, 63, 133. and elsewhere, in the time of *Nehemiah* (and before the Captivity) of Markets kept on the Jewish Sabbath; but doth it thence follow that (because some profaned it) the Jewish Sabbath was not at all observed? In the mean time, were no Markets held on Saturday? This you should have proved, to have proved a preference of Saturday-sabbath to the Lords day: (Otherwise, this proves no more for Saturday-sabbath than for Monday sabbath.) But you shew not a word of this.

You .

You tell us p. 117. (much to the same purpose) out of Mr. *Prin*, that we find by the *Writs* to summon Parliaments that they were of old appointed to meet upon *Sundays* (I suppose you mean, sometimes, not always,) even in the time of *Edw. I. Edw. II. Edw. III.* which *Edw. I.* succeeded *Hen. III.* who succeeded *King John*. The Successions you reckon right; (But all these are since the year 1200.) Pray do me the favour (next time you examine those Records) to inform me, whether (in those *Writs of Summons* and in the *Records* of those Parliaments) the *Sunday* be not called *dies Dominicus*. For if so, *Sunday* was then the *Lords day*, and so reputed, though Parliaments did sometimes meet on those days. And I have the more reason to think so, because even here you call it *the Dominical day*, which I presume you would not have done if it had not been there *dies Dominicus*.

I remember that in the Reign of *King Charles I.* (if I were not then mis-informed) they were wont to sit in *Privy-Counsel* and hear *Causes*, on *Sundays* in the afternoon; (whether well or ill I am not now to dispute,) and I have heard the reason assigned, because they could not meet on a better day than when there were solemn Prayers for them in all the Congregations of *England*. And I have been told (and perhaps you may remember it) that in the late Reigns, it was then usual to play at *Cards* on *Sundays*. Shall we thence conclude, the *Lords-day* was not then observed in *England*? You know the contrary.

But, you say further, *Rich. II.* who was deposed (you say) by his *Popish rebellious Subjects and Clergy* (what's this to the purpose? and on whom is this intended to reflect? on those of 48? or those of 88? or of 60?) who succeeded *Edw. III.* the *Parliament* appointed to meet upon *Sunday*, met that day and adjourned till *Monday*; From which time *Prin* says, no Parliaments have been summoned to meet on the *Dominical day*. (Doth Mr. *Prin* call it *the Dominical day*?) I confess I have not examined all the Records to answer this Allegation: But perhaps you may remember that (within our memory) *Oliver's Triennial Parliaments* were ordered to meet on *Sep. 3.* whatever day of the week it might happen to be; and that the first of those *Triennials* did meet on *Sunday, Sept. 3. 1654.* did then (I think) hear a *Sermon*, and adjourned till *Monday*. And you may remember that in the year 1641, the *Parliament* then sate on a *Sunday*, and their Printed Votes for that day, bear date *Die Dominico 8. Aug. 1641.* and if you search the *Journals of Parliament*, for that time, you will find it so. But shall we thence conclude, That, in those years, the *Lords day* was not observed in *England*? I should rather
from

from thence conclude (and we know it was so) that it was observed ; else their Votes would not have been dated *Die Dominico*.

You tell us several times, that *there be some Christians who to this day do observe Saturday*, and you tell us p. 120. who those are, the *Habissines*, or *Mid-land Ethiopians* (the same people, but by another name.) *Purchas*, you say, writes of the *Habissines*, as observing the *Saturday Sabbath*. What? that day solely, in opposition to the *Lords-day*? No; but *they keep it solemnly equal to the Dominical day*, for which you cite *Brerewood's Enquiries*. And (out of *Sandis Travels*) *they celebrate Saturday (as he calls it) as well as Sunday*. You own therefore their Celebration of the *Lords-day*; and therefore not of *Saturday* in stead of it, or in Opposition to it.

But you should have told us also (which is a second answer to that Allegation) that the same *Habissines* do observe *Circumcision* also; and so do *Judaize* in more things than one. And when they retain *Circumcision* (not in opposition to, but) in conjunction with *Baptism*, no wonder if they retain the *Jewish Sabbath* together with the *Lords-day*.

You tell us, p. 119. that the *Grecians and their Churches* (that is, some of them, not All,) *do keep the Saturday Festival*, that is (as your self expound it) *they eat Flesh on that day, and forbid to Fast on any Saturday except Easter-eve*. (For you tell us p. 98. that *by Fasting, is meant, Not-Dining*; and accordingly, to Dine is your Festival; and so you distinguish it *Enq. p. 93. some Dined and some Fasted on the Sabbath day*.) But do they not observe the *Lords-day*? Yes; *they celebrate divine service as solemnly on the Sabbath as on the Dominical day*. (We are then safe as to this point.) But you needed not have gone so far; you might have found those nearer home, who *solemnly Celebrate divine service on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays*, as well as on the *Lords-day*; (and in some places, on every day of the week;) But do they therefore not observe the *Lords day*?

You tells us p. 115. of divers *Provinces of Christians*, subject to the *Patriarch of Constantinople*. Well. But are there any of these *Provinces* which do not observe the *Lords-day*? and are you sure they do (all of them) *celebrate divine service on Saturday also*?

You tell us p. 115. that in in the year 1555, *there were (you think at Rome) some Sabbatarians; who, it seems, held that the Dominical day was not to be observed; but who are said to be otherwise Heretical*. But doth it thence follow, that the *Lords day* was not then observed at *Rome*? Perhaps it may be said, a hundred year hence, that, about this time, *Mr. Bampfield* wrote a Book for the
Satur.

Saturday Sabbath ; But shall it be thence concluded, that the *Lords-day* is not now generally observed in England ? Perhaps it may be said, that at some *Wakes* on the *Lords-day*, there have been *Bull-baitings*, and some other *Profanations* ? But must it be thence concluded, the *Lords-day* is not at all celebrated, because there are some who profane it ? as there always was, and always will be, as long as there be wicked Men in the world.

You had told us, (much to the same purpose) p. 105. that in the Year 603. some are said to preach by Jewish Superstition or the Grecian Custom, That it was a Duty to worship upon the Sabbath in like wise as upon the Dominical day. There was, it seems (even by those) no doubt made of the *Lords-day*, the onely doubt was, whether on *Saturday* also. And the like (for ought appears) might be the sense of your other *Sabbatarians* in 1555. for it is but it seems (as your self cite it) that they were against observing the *Lords-day* ; you do not affirm it, or that your Author so says : onely it seems so to you ; (because they are called *Sabbatarians*.)

You tell us p. 102. that *Socrates Scholasticus* (in the fourth Century) about the Diversity of Observations in divers places, touching *Easter*, *Fasting*, *Marriage*, *Service*, with other Ecclesiastical Rites, says, Touching the Communion there are sundry Observations and Customs, for though in a manner all Churches throughout the whole World do celebrate and receive the holy Mysteries, (that is, the Communion or *Lords Supper*) every Sabbath day after other (that is, as well on *Saturday*, as on any other day of the Week) yet the People inhabiting *Alexandria* and *Rome*, of an old tradition do not use it, (that is, because, as you tell us elsewhere, they used to Fast upon *Saturday* in memory of Christs lying in the Grave on that day, they did not use on *Saturdays* to have the Communion or *Lords Supper*, as on other days they had, as there was occasion.) And here you run out into a large descant about *Holy Mysteries*; that The celebrating and receiving the *Holy Mysteries*, you take to be their publick weekly Assemblies for Preaching, and for Hearing the Gospel preached, for Prayers and Praise, and for Baptism and the *Lords-supper*, &c. Now if you will take it so to be, who can can help it ? Others I suppose, will take the receiving the *Holy Mysteries* to be the receiving the *Lords-supper* in particular ; for you tell us 'tis the variety of Customs touching the Communion. And then you tell us, we have here *Socrates* a learned writer positively affirming all the Churches every where throughout the World, as every week came about, holding their Religious Assemblies, celebrating the Mysteries, i. e. administering Baptism, the *Lords Supper*, Prayer, Preaching, Singing, &c. upon the

the Sabbath day, that is the Seventh-day-sabbath, upon every Seventh day after other, except the Alexandrians and Romans; who then refused to do as all the Christian Churches in the world besides did, (which is your descant, not Socrates's words.) And a great Harangue about this we have for the greatest part of two pages, p. 102, 103. and you are at it again and again afterwards. And when all comes to all, it is no more but this, that the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, (who did, as all other Churches did, observe the Lords-day, but did use to Fast upon Saturday,) did not use on Saturday (their day of fast) to Celebrate the Lords Supper (as on other days they did, as there was occasion;) whereas other Churches (which did not use to fast on Saturday) did (as there was occasion) as well on that day, as any other, celebrate the Communion, from time to time. Surely you will not pretend (out of Socrates) that those other Churches did not observe the Dominical day: For that is contrary to your whole Collection. So that all this is but great Cry and little Wooll. How doth this prove that they did not observe the Lords-day? Which you know they did.

So that of all that we have heard hitherto, there is not one allegation, that I can see, of any people, who (whatever other days they did observe) did not observe the *Lords-day*.

But you tell us a long story, with your Descant about it, p. 106. and so onward to p. 116: as if the Observation of the *Lords-day* were not received in Scotland till the year 1203. because of a Law then made for that purpose (*you think*) by the King and Parliament of Scotland. Which I take to be much like to what you tell us elsewhere, p. 115, 117: of no Law for it in England by the King and Parliament till Edward the Sixth's time.) And would have it thought, that, till then, the Saturday-Sabbath was there observed. But this is to beg what you were to prove. If they did not till then receive the *Lords-day* (which I do not believe,) you should have proved that they observed (before that time) any Sabbath at all. But, in all your long Story, I do not find one word to that purpose. So that (for ought appears) the question was not between *Saturday-sabbath*, and *Sunday-sabbath*; but between *Sabbath* and *No-sabbath*. And if you think *this an honour to them that they were the last in this part of the World, which admitted the First day*, p. 111, 113. I do not take it to be at all an honour, that till then *they had no Sabbath at all*.

I do not doubt, for my own part, but that when they first received Christianity, they did with it (as other nations did) receive, the *Lords-day*. For whether Christianity were in Scotland first Planted by the Western Teachers, or (as you think p. 123.) by the Grecians, the *Lords-day* was observed by both: for though

they differed as to the point of *Easter*, (not whether it should be observed or no, but on what day it should be observed) they did not differ as to the *Lords-day*; but both agreed, as well that it should be observed, as on what day. And from whether soever of the two, the *Scots* received their *Christianity*, from the same (I doubt not) they received also the Observation of the *Lords-day*, which was common to both.

But I do not think it strange at all, considering the temper of mankind, (who are naturally more intent on things of this world, than on matters of Religion,) that they might by degrees grow remiss in it, and the thing be much neglected (as was the Jewish Sabbath in *Nehemiah's* time and long before.) And even where it is established by Law, there is frequent occasion of new laws to enforce and revive the old ones from time to time: As in *England* (we find) it hath been.

And this I suppose was the case of *Scotland* at that time, and perhaps of *England* too; that is, the *Lords-day* being too much neglected, and perhaps in some places disused, needed a new Law for the better observation of it; as was in *Nehemiah's* time for the Jewish Sabbath. But to think that the *Saturday-sabbath* had been till then observed, and now to be chang'd for the *Lords-day*, is a fancy of yours, without any foundation. If you would from hence prove any thing to the purpose, you should have shewed, that, before that time, they had observed the Jewish Sabbath. But, of this, here is not the least intimation in all that you produce.

I have now consider'd your *Collection* (because you thought it of concernment that I should so do,) and have done it fairly, taking it just as you give it us, without so much as consulting any of the Books which you cite (to see how fairly you have translated and represented what there you find :) which Books, if I had consulted, I doubt not but I might there have met with much in derogation of what you would thence persuade us.

So that, upon the whole matter, there is nothing appears in your whole *Collection*, but that where any Sabbath (or day of Holy Rest) was at all kept amongst Christians, the *Lords-day* was there observed; and whatever other days were observed also (as many were in many places, and still are,) it was not any where in opposition to the *Lords-day*, but in concurrence with it. As, amongst us, there be frequent Week-day Lectures, and publick Prayers, for those to repair to whose occasions and opportunities do permit; and in *Colleges*, *Cathedrals*, and many other Churches and Chapels, every day; but no where in opposition to the *Lords-day*.

It

It appears also, all along, from your own Collection, that from the first Century (in the Apostles time) to this day, *dies Dominicus*, the *Lords-day* (or as you call it the *Dominical day*) is on all hands agreed to signify *the first day of the week*, in contradistinction to the *Jewish Sabbath*.

And whereas you reproach us so often with *Rome*, the *Romanists*, the *Roman World*, *Romish Traditions*, &c. (about 120 times or more in your *Enquiry*, and very often, though not so often, in your *Reply*) as if the observation of the *Lords-day*, or as you call it the *Dominical Day*, came onely from *Romish Usurpation* (*imposing of Laws upon all the World*) 'Tis notoriously known that *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus* and others, were none of the *Romish World*, but *Greek Fathers*, and antecedent to the *Romish Usurpation*, which you own, (*Eng. p. 125*) *not to be assumed in divers Centuries* (divers hundred years) after their time.

'Tis manifest therefore (from your own Collection) that the *Lords-day*, was *the first day of the week* (not the *seventh*) and so reputed, and known by that name even in the first Century, wherein the Apostles lived, (and before *St. John* wrote the *Revelation*), and hath been so reputed ever since, and as such generally observed by Christians wherever they observed any Sabbath at all : And (as you speak *Eng. p. 93.*) *all Christians in the World did agree*, (as well which was the *Lords-day*, as) *which was the Sabbath* ; and if not so, then (as *p. 78.*) *all Christians hitherto in the world must be out in their reckoning*, (and to the same purpose *Rep. p. 3.*) which if it be a good argument to prove that *our Saturday* is the *Jews Sabbath*, it proves as well that *our Sunday*, is the *Lords-day*.

But when I say, it hath been generally so observed ; I do not mean it of every single person : (For no doubt but that some persons who call themselves *Christians*, may be so profane as to keep no Sabbath ; or so remiss (as you speak *Eng. p. 117.*) as not much if at all : And that some others may have had some peculiar Whimfies of their own :) But no *Church*, or *Society of Christians* (that we know of) who kept any Sabbath at all, who did not observe the *Lords-day*.

I have now done with that point (and shewed, I think, sufficiently) that the *Lords-day*, *Rev. 1. 10.* is (as our *Records* and *Acts of Parliament* call it) the *Lords-day*, commonly called *Sunday*.

And I shall here conclude that first point, to warrant our Observation of that day, from those *Many* and *Great* Precedents that we have of such Observation, by *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and the

Christian Churches, both in that age, and ever since.

By the Example of Christ, who on the day of his *Resurrection* (which is by all agreed to be *the first day of the week*) *Preaching* that doctrine to the *Women* who came to the Sepulcher, and then to the *two disciples* going to *Emmaus*, and Celebrating the *Lords Supper* with them; and afterwards *assembling* with his *Disciples* at *Jerusalem*, *Preaching* to them the same doctrine, *Reproving* their Unbelief, *Confirming* their Faith, *Blessing* their Assembly, *Ordaining* them to the Office of *Apostles* (who before were *Disciples*) and giving them *Instructions* for *Planting* the Christian Church in *All Nations*, of *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*.

By his *second* assembling with them on the *next Lords day*, having intermitted all the intermediate days, even that of the *Jewish Sabbath*, (as appears *Joh. 21. 1, 14.* where when *after these things*, he again *shewed himself* to them at the *Sea of Tiberias*, 'tis expressly noted, *This is now the Third time that Jesus shewed himself to his Disciples after he was risen from the Dead*; and therefore but twice before, not on the *Jewish Sabbath* which came between.) Which *second* assembling was employed in such *Religious Exercises* as was the first.

By the *Miraculous Effusion* of the *Holy Ghost*, with the *Gift of Tongues*, on the day of *Pentecost* (which was also the *first day of the week*, being the *morrow after the Sabbath*,) when also, upon *Peter's* long Sermon, were added to the Church *about three Thousand souls*.

By *St. Paul's* Assembling with a *large Congregation* of *Disciples* then met at *Troas* purposely to *break bread* (or celebrate the *Lords Supper*) as being *the first day of the week* (proper for such religious exercise,) *Preaching* to them a long Sermon, and celebrating the *Lords Supper* with them.

By *St. Paul's* Directions to the Churches of *Galatia*, and to those at *Corinth* (who had their *solemn Assemblies*, or *gathering together*, in the name of our Lord Jesus, *1 Cor. 5. 4.*) that on every first day of the week (*ἡ πρώτη τοῦ σαββάτου*) they should have a *Collection* for the *Saints*, *1 Cor. 16. 1, 2.* Which doth sufficiently intimate, on what day it was, that they were wont to have such *solemn Assemblies*.

By *St. John's* being in the Spirit on the *Lords day*, a day at that time known by that name, even before his writing the *Revelation*; and both in that age and ever since (as appears from your own *Collections*) understood to be *the first day of the week*, and observed as such; the *Dominical day* (as you translate it) and the *first day of the week*, being (to use your own language) by *all Christians in the world* taken to be the same: and was, as such, solemnly observed, presently after

after the Apostles time (as well as in it) as appears from *Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus*, and others, who were none of the *Romish World*, and lived before the *Romish Usurpation*, which was not (as you acknowledge) for many ages after that time.

And all these precedents so fully cleared from those *little* exceptions (if I may so call them) that I see no reason in the least to question the matter of fact. Or if what I think *weak* and *little* you think to be *great* and momentous, I cannot help it. Let the Reader judge.

Now what was thus practised by Christ himself, and by his Apostles, and by these caused to be practised in the Constitution of the Christian Church, we have no cause to doubt but that they had sufficient authority for so doing. Otherwise we are at a loss as to most of what was done by them. They did appoint *Deacons* in the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Act. 6.* And, because they did it, we presume they had authority so to do. *Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in every Church*, in their progress *Act. 14.* (whether *Deacons* also in every Church, or there onely where they saw occasion, we cannot tell.) And *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, by *Paul's* direction, was to do the like there, as to *Bishops* and *Deacons*, *1 Tim. 4.* And *Titus* had the like order for *Creet* to ordain *Elders in every City*, *Tit. 1. 5.* And I find a *Bishop* there named, *ver. 7.* But whether *Bishop* and *Elder* be there the same, or how they differ, I list not here to dispute, because it is nothing to the present purpose: But of *Deacons* I find there no mention. And because these things were done, we presume they had sufficient authority so to do: though we do not find, from Christ, any express Command in particular for each of these. And the like to the *Corinthians* for their Church Assemblies, and therein for *Excommunicating*, or delivering to *Satan*, of the Incessuous Corinthian. *1 Cor. 5. 4, 5.* And their practise is to us a sufficient warrant for so doing. And the like for their Celebrating the *Lords-day*.

Now when the *Lords-day* was thus celebrated by Christ, by the Apostles, and by the Christian Church then, as well as ever since; and called *ἡμέρα κυρίου* the *Lords day*, just in the same form as *ἄριστον κυρίου* the *Lords Supper*; I think it reasonable to understand the same word in the same sense as to both: And as *ἄριστον κυρίου* the *Lords Supper* signifies the Feast or Supper, commanded by our Lord (meaning Our Lord Jesus Christ, as founder of the Christian Religion;) so *ἡμέρα κυρίου* the *Lords day* should signify the day commanded by our Lord (in the same sense) though that command be not particularly recorded. Like as we may reasonably suppose, that the Worship-
ing

ing of God by *Sacrifice* (before the Flood) was *commanded*, (because it was accepted) though that *command* be not recorded; and that the distinction between *Clean and Unclean Beasts* was (before the Flood) *commanded* (because approved by God) though that *command* be not recorded; and that there was *command* (though not recorded) for taking the *fire for incense* from the *Altar*, else *Nadab and Abihu* would not have been destroyed for offering *strange fire*; and as (beside Gods *resting* Gen. 2. 2, 3.) You do suppose *Adam and Eve* were *commanded* to *rest also*, though that *command* be not recorded: So, we may reasonably believe that the observation of the *Lords day*, was by our Lord *commanded* (because so practised by himself and the Christian Church) though that *particular Command* be not recorded. And this, though not recorded, seems to have been then so well known, that it was received without any scruple (that we find) as well as *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*; All the question was, whether they must with *Baptism* retain *Circumcision*; and the Jewish *Pass-over* with the *Lords Supper*; and, with the *Lords day*, the Jewish *Sabbath* also. All which points the Apostle leaves *indifferent* as to the *Jews* (to whom they had been a Law) that each one might practice according as they were persuaded (and did himself comply therein;) but not as to the *Gentiles*, to whom it had not been a Law.

And this I think sufficient as to the *Observation* of the *Lords day*.

The next point is, Whether the *Lords day*, thus observed, may be called a *Sabbath*. For that is the great Objection, If so observed, and wont to be so observed, yet not upon a *Sabbatical* account, nor is it *any where* called a *Sabbath*. Rep. p. 37.

Now if I should admit (which I am not forward to do) what you have Rep. p. 50. that all *Judaical Observations of Days*, whether *Feasts or Fasts, Weekly, Monthly or Annual*, were called their *Sabbaths*: Or what you have Enq. p. 93. *When Christians do agree upon a day to assemble for the publick worship of God, there doth appear no great difference whether they Fast or Feast upon that day*: We need not be much solicitous about the *Name*. For, at that rate, no doubt but this may be called a *Sabbath*. And accordingly, because the *Pass-over* and *Pentecost*, are called *Festivals*, Lev. 23. you call them *Sabbaths*, Rep. p. 48.

But I am not willing to admit that loose acceptation of the Word: but take it to be a *Sabbath* in the proper sense of the word *Sabbath* in the *Fourth Commandment*: that is, the *Seventh day of Rest, next after Six days of Labour*. For so it is, if the *Lords day* be duly observed

served as it ought to be; and, as such, is within the prospect of the Fourth Commandment, what ever *Name* we call it by. For, in all the Precedents before alleged, we do not find any other than *Religious Exercises* therein performed, or what is consistent with such. And if your rule be good, to which you refer *Enq. p. 47. de non existentibus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio*: Or, what you would suppose, *Rep. p. 33.* that *Paul's preaching in the Synagogue did comprehend his conscientious observing the whole Sabbath day*: We are then to suppose as well, that the whole *Lords day* was spent in *Religious Exercises* or *Sabbatical employments*, (such as *Praying, Preaching, Exhortations, the Lords Supper, Collections for indigent Saints*, and other *Sabbatical Employments*) since no other appear.

But I do allow that, because of the Ambiguity which would arise if the *Jewish Sabbath* and the *Christian Sabbath* were indifferently called by the same name, without distinction; therefore, by way of distinction from the *Jewish Sabbath* (which was commonly understood by that name) the *Christian Sabbath* was commonly called (by a distinguishing title) *the first day of the week*, or the *Lords day*. And if you do not think fit to allow it the name of *Sabbath*, I shall be as well contented that you call it (as the Scripture doth, and the Christian Church ever since) *the Lords day*.

Yet I shall not presently grant you, (as *Enq. p. 28.*) that, *in the Old and New Testament the First day is never called the Sabbath*. For there be at least two places in the New Testament that bid fair for it, if they do not certainly so signify.

One is that in *Mat. 24. 20.* *Pray that your flight be not in the Winter, nor on the Sabbath-day*. I know you would restrain this to the Jewish Sabbath onely, not extend it to that of the Christians also: But it stands as fair for the *Christian Sabbath*. For it would be as well a grief, to the *Christians* to fly on *their Sabbath*, as for the *Jews* on *theirs*; (though not a *Sin* in either, in a case of necessity.) And though the *Christian Sabbath* were not yet in use when Christ spake the words, yet it would be so before the case happened; and though the Disciples at present might not then be aware of that sense, it would be time enough then to understand it, when there should be occasion for it. For so it was in many other cases. As *Job. 2. 19, 21, 22.* *Destroy this Temple* (saith Christ) *and in three days I will raise it up*; meaning it of *the temple of his body*; which though the disciples did not presently understand, yet when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and then they understood his meaning. And *Job. 13. 7.* (*Jesus to Peter, about washing his feet,*) *What I do, thou knowest not now, but*

but thou shalt know hereafter. And ver. 10, 11. *Ye are clean* (saith Christ) *but not all*; For he knew who should betray him, and therefore said *Ye are not all clean*. So Job. 19. 24. *They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots*, and ver. 28, 29. of giving him gall and vinegar to drink, and ver. 36. *a bone of him shall not be broken*, and ver. 37. *they shall look on him whom they pierced*; were not things so understood till long after they were spoken. And Job. 14. 26. Christ tells his disciples, *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, shall Teach you all things and bring to your Remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you*; and so bring to their Remembrance, as that they should then better understand them, than when they were first spoken. Accordingly when he bids them *Pray* that their *flight* be not on the *Sabbath*; that is, on such a day as shall then be Sabbath. And in the Greek it is *ἐν σαββάτῳ* on a Sabbath, not *ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ* on The Sabbath. You make sometimes a great matter of the difference between *a* and *the*, when you think it for your advantage; and you may as well take notice that the article *The* is here (in the Original) omitted; and a *Sabbath* may as well relate to any Sabbath or day of *Holy Rest*, as to the Jews *Seventh-day Sabbath*. And I could cite to you the authorities (if that were the way of argument between you and me) of *eminently Holy and Learned men*, who think the *Christian Sabbath* to be here meant, though the disciples were not *then* aware of it, but should be before the time came. And I do the rather take it so to be, because Christ bids them *Pray* that it should *not be* on what should *then* be their Sabbath. But it is notoriously known that it *did* happen on the *Jews Sabbath* (though not on the *Lords day*, or *Christian Sabbath*), and it doth not seem likely, that Christ would *bid them Pray*, against what he *knew* was to come to pass, but rather against what (upon such prayer) they *might escape*; as accordingly they did, their flight not happening on the *Christian Sabbath*. And it is noted by *Dio Cassius* who relates the Story, that their *Superstitious observing* that day (so as not to labour on it, though in their own defense) was the occasion of its being on that day; the *Romans* (being aware of it) making *their Assault* on that day.

The other place is *Act. 13. 42. When the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath*; (so we translate it;) It is in the Greek *ὅτι τὸ μετὰ τὸ σαββάτον*. I remember you object *Rep. p. 79.* that if the Christians did observe *the first day of the week*, why did not the Gentiles desire these words to be preached to them *the next day*, rather than *the next Sabbath*? meaning, the next Jewish Sabbath.

The

The Gentiles (you say) *besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath; not the next morning upon the First day of the week; but, the next Sabbath.* Now, it seems to me much one, the *next Sabbath* (meaning the *Christian Sabbath*,) was the *next day*; and that on *this day* they did desire to hear further discourse on the same subject. 'Tis true that our Translators render it barely, *the next Sabbath*; but they tell us in the Margin, that it is in the Greek, *in the Sabbath between*; and so it is, *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τὸ σαββάτῳ*. We are told ver. 14. that *they* (Paul and Barnabas) at Antioch in Pisidia, *went into the Synagogue τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ σαββάτῳ on the Sabbath-day* (where observe, that *σαββάτῳ* though in the plural number, doth signify not many but one Sabbath-day; for it is not *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*, but *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, *τῇ σαββάτῳ*, contrary to your observation Eng. p. 70. where you say it is *no where* so used; which though you do retract Rep. p. 46. yet even here you be hankering upon it, that the plural number doth ordinarily signify *More than one*.) And, though but *One day*, it may well be called *ἡμέρα τῇ σαββάτῳ* (the day of Rests) because in that *one day* there were to be *more Rests* than *One*; a Rest from Sin, a Rest from Labours of divers sorts, from finding our own pleasure, and speaking our own words, and a holy Rest in Religious Exercises, delighting our selves in the Lord, and the like. Of their Sermon there (or as it is there called a *Word of Exhortation to the people*) we have a large account ending at ver. 41. And at ver. 44. we have an account of what passed on the *next Sabbath*, or the *ensuing Sabbath*, *τῇ ἐχθέρῃ σαββάτῳ*, or *τῇ ἐχθέρῃ σαββάτῳ* (for 'tis read both ways to the same sense,) meaning the *next Jewish Sabbath* (as appears by the Company there present ver. 45. &c.) But in the former of those two Sabbaths *when the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue*, or *when they were gone out of the Synagogue of the Jews* (for the Greek will indifferently bear either translation) the *Gentiles besought that those words might be preached to Them* (separately from the Jews). *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τὸ σαββάτῳ on the Sabbath between, or on the intermediate Sabbath.* For as *ἐν τῷ μετὰ τῷ* doth in the Greek signify the *intermediate time*, or the *time between*; so *τῷ μετὰ τὸ σαββάτῳ* is the *Sabbath between* or the *intermediate Sabbath*. Now what can be that *intermediate Sabbath* (between two next Sabbaths of the Jews) on which they should preach to the *Gentiles* (in contradistinction to the Jews) but the *Christian Sabbath on the first day of the week*. Which by our Translators is well enough rendered *the next Sabbath* (as being indeed the next day) with this note upon it, that (in the original) it is *the Sabbath between*. And even upon the dissolution of that first assembly (*when the congregation was broken up*) many of the Jews and religious

Proselytes (not waiting till the next Jewish Sabbath) followed Paul and Barnabas (for further instruction therein) who speaking (or preaching) to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God, ver. 43. So that here, I think, the first day is again called the Sabbath; not the Jewish Sabbath, but the Sabbath between two Jewish Sabbaths.

And I take it also to be so called in the Fourth Commandment, *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day*, or the day of Rest, that is such day as from time to time shall be the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day (after those six days of labour) the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. This seventh day was (I suppose) at that time, the seventh day from the first raining of Manna, *Exod. 16. 21, 22, 25, 26.* But that it was always to continue in course from the first raining of Manna, I do not find; nor am I sure that it did so continue even to our Saviours time, but might be intermitted, and forgotten during the Babylonish Captivity, till it was again renewed by *Nehemiah*: And if, upon our Saviours Resurrection, another day did thenceforth become the Sabbath (as I think it did;) whatever day should from time to time become the Sabbath, that day they were to keep holy. And this without any change in the Commandment at all. I suppose you do allow that the Affirmative part of the Second Commandment doth require us to observe Gods instituted Worship, (or, that he should be worshiped in such manner as himself appoints,) and consequently, the *Levitical Priesthood and Sacrifices* so long as they should continue; as being Gods then-instituted Worship, as *Eng. p. 68.* But when God, instead thereof, gave us a more spiritual Ministry (as you own it to be,) That then ceased, and This began, to be Gods instituted Worship, and did (without any alteration of that Law at all) fall under the Second Commandment, as, before, the other did. In like manner, the seventh Commandment, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, binds the Woman to this Husband; but if this husband be dead and she marry to another, the same law (not one jot or tittle altered) binds her to this other husband; as the Apostle argues *Rom. 7. 2, 3.* For, though the Case be altered, the Law is still the same. And in like manner, if the Lords day become now the Christians day of holy Rest, (as we think it doth) this now is the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, as much as the Seventh day from the first raining of Manna was before. Like as the second husband (after the death of the first) becomes the Husband in the Seventh Commandment, as much as the First was while he was living. And the Lords day is now as much the seventh day after the six days of Labour, as was that other from the first raining of Manna. But whether this or that or neither, be the seventh day in course from the first Cre-

Creation, neither you nor I know; nor is it necessary that we should.

As to what you object hereupon (*Rep.* p. 2, 3. and very often afterward to the like purpose) if *I do not know nor can know what day of the week Sunday is, why should I write a book for the observation of a day which it is impossible to know?* My Answer is, I know very well which day of our *Week* it is; and write for the observation of *this* day: But what day of the week it is in a continual circulation of weeks from the Creation, I do not know (nor do you) and therefore for such first or seventh day, I do not write: and if you write for such seventh day, you write for you know not what. And I write for that Lords-day, which I take to be so in a continual succession from Christs time; so far as that can be known: that is (as you speak *Rep.* p. 3.) *What all Christian and Hebrew Churches in the World agree to be it:* Or (*Eng.* p. 78.) *if all Jews and Christians in the world be not out in their reckoning:* Or if that be it, which you say (*Eng.* p. 93.) *all the Christians in the World agree to be it.* That is, so far as we may trust to an *Universal Tradition* in a matter of fact. For this *Universal agreement*, is but *Universal Tradition* and no more: And more than this you cannot have, nor do pretend to have, for determining, which is your Seventh day. And therefore I did you no wrong in saying (*Disc.* p. 1.) that *you have no other way (than Common Tradition) whereby to guess which is the first or seventh day in such circulation even from Christs time,* (though when you cite my words, you think fit to leave out *other than common tradition.*) So far as this can assure us we are assured; but beyond this, neither you nor I can be sure which is the day. Nor do I think it much material, whether we be or be not mistaken therein, if we observe the day which is *so reputed*. According as before I have shewed, of the Jews *Pass-over* and *New-moons*. For (according to the method they are said to have observed for determining the day of the *New-Moon*, and consequently the *Day* and *Month* of the *Pass-over* thereupon depending, *viz.* by the first sight of the Moon after the Change,) it was a rare case not to miss of the true day, (for 'tis very rare to see the Moon on the true day of the *New-Moon*;) and, in case the Full-moon was near the Equinox, it might be equally uncertain, which was the *First Month*: Yet the *Pass-over*, and the *New Moons*, were Religiously Observed, on the *reputed Day*, of the *reputed Month*; and it was, I doubt not, as well accepted as if on the just day: and so would be our *Lords day*, if possibly we should *mis-take*, in the *common Tradition*. And the case is just the same with you as with us, as to this point; for you are blind-fold in guessing which day is a *seventh* in course from the Cre-

ation; and with more *Uncertainty*, than we do in judging which is the *Lords day* in a continual succession from *Christs time*; of which you tell us that *all Jews and Christians in the World* are agreed, which is the *Dominical day*. And it is much more likely that *our* common tradition, as to the *Lords day*, since *Christs time*, doth not deceive us, than *yours* for the *seventh day* in course from *the first Creation*. For, by your own confession, no nation but the *Jews* (if they) observed this *seventh from the Creation*; nor yet (for ought appears) did even the *Jews* reckon their time by *weeks* till after their coming out of *Egypt*: Whereas, since *Christs time*, and the planting of Christianity, 'tis the general way of reckoning every where; and if one nation should chance to *mis-take* or *forget* it, others would rectify it.

This point being thus dispatched; It remains to enquire, Whether (beside the *Lords-day*) we are to observe the *Jewish Sabbath* also. Be not offended (as sometimes you seem to be *Rep. p. 51. 55.*) that I call it the *Jewish Sabbath*. For I find, you can also so call it; as *Enq. p. 38. The Jews Seventh-day-sabbath*; and *p. 66. the Jewish Sabbath*; and *p. 74. the Jewish Seventh-day-sabbath*: and elsewhere. Nor do I mean any hurt in so calling it; or thereby to Reproach the day. For I would not Reproach, either *Circumcision*, or the *Pass over*, or the *Levitical Priesthood*, or any of the *Sacrifices*, or *Ceremonies* of the *Ceremonial Law*, which was *then* the appointed Service of God, though now it be not. I use it onely as a *distinctive name* from that of the *Lords-day*. For I take this *now* to be a *Sabbath day*, and the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, (intended in the Fourth Commandment,) as much as the *Jews Seventh-day-Sabbath*, *then* was: that is (not onely *A Seventh-day*, as you use to distinguish, but) *The seventh day after six days of Labour*: Though possibly not *the seventh* in course from the *first Creation*, nor perhaps *the seventh* in course from the *first raining of Manna*.

That the *Lords-day*, was, and is to be Observed; I think I have sufficiently shewed already. As to that other question, whether the *Jewish Sabbath* ought to be observed also: You seem to answer for me, *Enq. p. 46. Nor are there two Weekly days set apart by God for holy Worship*, and so I think this question needs no further Labour. And *Rep. p. 33. I know none has yet imagined that Paul and the Christians kept two Sabbath days in one Week*. And yet again *Rep. p. 66. I take as agreed, we are not to keep two days in a Week*. All which are your own words.

But I think fit to answer it a little more distinctly. I would distinguish between what is *now* our *Duty*, and what might *then* by the *Jews lawfully* be done. I do not think it is *now* our *Duty* (be-

(beside *Baptism*) to use *Circumcision*; or (beside the *Lords Supper*) to use the *Jewish Pass-over*: Yet I think it *then* was *lawful* for a *Jew* to use both (if they were so perswaded) till by time, and leisure, they should come better to understand their *Christian Liberty*. Which your self, I think, will not deny. But I do not think *The Jews* (and much less the *Gentiles*) to be under an *Obligation* so to do. And I suppose you do allow this also; For you think (*Eng. p. 122.*) that *Paul did keep* the *Jewish Pass-over*, but (*p. 123.*) that *he was under no Obligation so to do*.

And I take the case of the *Jewish Sabbath* to be just the same. Those of the *Jews* who were *zealous of the Law*, thinking the *Mosaick Law* was yet in force as to *Circumcision* and other *Rites* as well as to their *Sabbath*, did think themselves obliged (though indeed they were not, otherwise than by the mistake of an *Erroneous Conscience*) to observe *Circumcision* and their *Sabbath*, together with *Baptism* and the *Lords-day*. And those who did not think themselves so *Obliged*, did yet think it *Lawful* so to do, (as is undeniable in the Case of *Paul*.) And it was not only *Lawful* but *Commendable*, to take the opportunity of a publick *Concourse* whether of *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as well on *that* as on any other day, to *preach* to them the *Gospel of Christ*. For so we find they did, not onely on the *Sabbath*, but *daily in the Temple*, *Act. 2. 46. Act. 5. 42.* and *in the Market daily Act. 17. 17.* and *in Areopagus, or Mars-hill, ver. 22.* And no man doubts, I think, (or need doubt) but that we may lawfully meet on other days than the *Lords-day* for the *Worship of God*.

You tell us indeed *Eng. p. 121.* that on the other six days we are *Commanded to Labour*; and complain *p. 131.* (as an *incroachment* on our working time) that *this part of the Fourth Command (six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do) is in effect much laid aside* (by appointing the Service of God on some of those days;) and *Rep. p. 6.* the other six *Allowed for Work*, or rather *wherein we are Commanded to work*. But, I hope you do not think, we are so *Commanded* then to work, as that we are *Forbid to Pray*, or to *bear a Sermon*, on one of those days. If God do not (in the fourth Commandment) *command* any other day (to all in general;) yet neither doth he there *Forbid* it. You may remember that, in the *Mosaick Law*, besides the *commanded services*, there were *Free-will Offerings* that might be offered. And (whatever your opinion be against *meeting twice* in publick for *Sabbath-services* on the *Sabbath-day*.) I should hope you would think it *allowable* (for those whose other occasions may Well permit it) to attend a *Week-day Lecture*, where it may conveniently be had. And the Apostles,
no

no doubt, whose daily business it was to preach the Gospel, might (on this day as well as any other) take the opportunity, of the Jews meeting in the *Synagogue* (as well as of the *Athenians* meeting in the *Market* *Act*. 17. 17.) to preach the Word to them. And I think it might be as *Lawful* then (though not a *Duty*) for the *Believing Jews*, to meet on *their Sabbath*, as it was to practice *Circumcision*, if they were so persuaded. But to *impose* it on the *Gentiles* as a *Duty*, was (I think) not *then* to be done, and much less *now*.

By *Gentiles* I do not hear mean *Circumcised Proselytes*; for these (though *naturally Gentiles* and not of the *seed of Abraham*) did (by being circumcised) become *naturalized Jews*, and thereby *members* of the *Jewish Church* (and might eat the *Pass-over*) as well as if they had been *Native Jews*, *Exod.* 12. 48. But I mean those *Christian Gentiles* (yet *uncircumcised*) concerning whom the *question* now was whether they ought to be *circumcised* and observe the *Law of Moses*, *Act*. 15. 1, 5, 24. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3. For some *Jews* (or *Judaizing Christians*) taught the *Brethren*, that *Except they were circumcised, after the manner of Moses, they could not be saved*: As if *Salvation* were so of the *Jews*, as that, without being brought within the *Pale* of the *Jewish Church*, they could not be saved by their *Messias*.

Somewhat consonant to your doctrine, *Eng.* p. 79. that the *Jews* in *Egypt*, was the *whole visible Church of Christ in the World*. (I should have said the *Church of God*, in contradistinction to the *Christian Church*: Nor would I have said the *whole Church*.) That they were a *considerable part*, and that they were more *peculiarly* so, because of the promise made to *Abraham* and his *seed*, of which *Circumcision* was a *Sign*; thus much I had granted, *Disc.* p. 60. with which you are not satisfied, *Rep.* p. 52. But that they (as the *seed of Abraham*.) were the *whole visible Church of God*, I cannot allow. I think that *Melchizedek* (a *Priest of the most High God*) whoever he was, and his *people*, were *part of Gods Visible Church*; though not of the *seed of Abraham*, nor *circumcised* (that I know) or *required so to be*. And the like of *Lot* (*righteous Lot*, though not *circumcised*, that I know of, nor *required so to be*, nor any member of the *Jewish Church*.) and his *Family*, and his *posterity* (so long as they continued to worship the true God;) and *Abrahams kindred* at *Ur* and *Haran*; who though they were not of the *seed of Abraham* (nor incorporated into his family;) yet I do not know that they had cast off the *Worship of the true God* (though perhaps otherwise faulty;) and all the *Posterity of Abraham* by *Heturah*; many

many of whom, no doubt, did for a long time continue to worship the true God: who though of *Abraham's posterity* yet were no part of the *Jewish Church in Egypt*, whom yet (*Eng. p. 79. Rep. p. 52.*) you would have to be the *whole Church*. The like of *Yethro* (Priest, or Prince of *Midian*) of whom we have a large account *Exod. 2.* and *Exod. 18.* was doubtless (as thence appears) a *good man*, and a *worshiper of the true God*; but the *Midianites*, (as well as the *Edomites*, the *Moabites*, the *Ammonites*, the *Amalekites*, and others,) are still contradistinguished to the *Israelites* brought out of *Egypt*. And no doubt but many of *Yethro's* people, as well as himself, were *Worshipers of the true God*, and part of *God's Visible Church*. And I judge the like of *Aner*, and *Eschcol*, and *Manre*, (*Abram's Confederates* *Gen. 14. 13, 24.*) though they lived in *Canaan*, as he did. And there is no doubt of *Job*, and his *three Friends*, (who seem all to be *Princes*, or *Great men*, and to have great *Dependences*) and *Elibu* (who was a fourth,) were part of *God's visible Church*; and many of their *people* or *dependents*; but no part of the *Israelites in Egypt*, though contemporary with them. Nor can it be said of any of them, that *God brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage*. And I do not know but that *Balaam* (though otherwise a *bad man*, as *Cain* also was,) might be a *Worshiper of the true God*. And the *Kenites* also, (of whose kindness to the *Israelites* we find mention, *Judg. 4. 11, 17.*) And the *Widow of Sarepta* (a *Zidonian*) *1 King. 17.* And *Naaman the Syrian*, *2 King. 5. 15, 17.* who owns that *there is no other God in all the earth but the God of Israel*, and would thenceforth, *offer neither burnt-offerings nor sacrifice to any other God, but unto the LORD* (*Jehovah*). And I see no cause to question it, but that many others of those who were *Profelyti Portæ*, though not *Profelyti Fæderis* (as they use to be distinguished) were *good men*, and *worshipers of the true God*, and members of *God's visible Church*, though not of the *Jewish Church*. Such I suppose was the *Centurion* *Luk. 7.* who though he loved their nation and built them a *Synagogue*, ver. 5. yet was not of the *Jewish Church*, as appears ver. 9. *I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel*. And the same is manifest in *Cornelius*: Who was a *devout man*, and one that feared God, and all his house, *Act. 10. 2.* (and, amongst the rest, his two household servants, and the devout souldier who waited on him, that were sent for *Peter*, ver. 7.) with many of his kindred and near friends, ver. 24, 33, 44, 46; and was one whose prayers were heard and his alms were had in memorial before God, ver. 4, 31. a just man, and one that feared God, and (though not a Jew) of good report among all the nation of the Jews, ver. 22. and who was there-

therefore (even before his becoming Christian upon *Peter's* preaching) one of *God's visible Church* (as were those others also with him;) yet not a Jew, nor in communion with the Jewish Church; but one of another nation, with whom it was thought unlawful for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto him, ver. 28. that is, to have familiar converse with him. So that the Jewish Church was not the Whole visible Church of God. And this *Peter* acknowledgeth ver. 34, 35. of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. Nor was this then a New truth (how contemptibly soever the Jews thought of other nations) but is cited from *Deut. 10. 17, 18, 19.* And accordingly *Peter* (at ver. 47, 48.) admits them all to Christian Baptism, without requiring them first to be circumcised or become Jews.

I do not deny but that the Jews had many advantages above the Gentiles; as *Paul* argues *Rom. 3. 1, 2.* chiefly, because to them were committed the oracles of God, whereby they had better opportunity of knowing his will; But as to the Rule of Salvation, it was the same to both; as he there argues ver. 24. &c. The righteousness of God, by faith in Jesus Christ is unto all and upon all that believe (whether Jew or Gentile) for there is no difference. And *Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.* he argues at large that this blessedness cometh not upon the Circumcision onely (on the Jewish Church onely) but upon the Uncircumcision also; for that Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness, not when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; and he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had being yet Uncircumcised; that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also.

And I should have thought you might have been of the same mind, by what you argued *Enq. p. 26.* Before the Moral law given, one law was to the Jews and Gentiles; and we may say, What difference was there Then or is there Now, between them and us? Those of the Jews or Gentiles then, living and dying impenitently, had not Salvation by the Messiah: Those of Them or the Gentiles then, who joined themselves to the Lord, to serve him, had eternal Life. And if so, I see not why they should not be thought part of God's visible Church. 'Tis true that, without being Circumcised they might not eat the Pass-over *Exod. 12. 28.* because not of the Jewish Church; but it doth not therefore follow that they were not of the Church of God.

So that Salvation, even then, was not confined to the Jewish Church

Church, or the Seed of Abraham, but common to all that believed, to all that did fear God and work righteousness, of whatever Nation. And those who did so, were part of Gods visible Church, though not Jews, nor incorporated into their Church. So that those then in Egypt were not the whole visible Church of God, as you would have it Enq. p. 79. Rep. p. 52. But if by those words who join themselves to the Lord, you mean onely those who joyned themselves to the Jewish Church (as if none but such might be saved by their Messiah, though otherwise fearing God and serving him,) You perfectly fall in with those Judaizing Christians (Aet. 15. 1. Gal. 5. 1.) who taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.

And therefore I am still of opinion (notwithstanding your thinking otherwise) that what God says to the Jews, as well of Circumcision, as the Jewish Sabbath (on the seventh day from the first raining of Manna) as a Sign, or Covenant between him and them, is intended as a distinctive mark given to the Jews, as Gods more peculiar People (not as the whole visible Church) in contradiction to other Nations. Of Circumcision he says to Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and thy seed after thee; (not as you would have it Rep. p. 52. with all true believers of all nations, in all ages, from the beginning of the world to the end of it, to distinguish them from the disobedient to Gods law.) And ver. 10, 11. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee (is this meant of All Nations to the Worlds end? to wit) every male child amongst you shall be circumcised, and it shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you (that is, You the seed of Abraham; for no other were to be circumcised, unless incorporated with them.) And ver. 13. my Covenant shall be in your flesh an everlasting Covenant, (not as if Circumcision were to be for ever obligatory; but, while things continued in that State of distinction between Jews and Gentiles.) And in like manner concerning the Jewish Sabbath, Exod. 31. 13. My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a Sign between me and You (that is, You the Children of Israel to whom it was spoken) throughout your Generations. And ver. 16. the Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual Covenant, and ver. 17. It is a Sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever (which plainly shews, who were meant by You). So Ezek. 20. 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20. Son of man, speak to the Elders of Israel — In the day when I chose Israel, and*

lifted up my hand unto the Seed of the house of Jacob, and made my self known to them in the land of Egypt, — to bring them forth of the land of Egypt, — I caused them to go forth of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the Wilderness. — I gave them (in the Wilderness) my Sabbaths to be a Sign between me and them (who are these, but those that were brought out of Egypt,) but the house of Israel rebelled against me in the Wilderness, (are these all true believers from the beginning of the world, to the worlds end?) — and my Sabbaths they polluted; — But I said unto their Children in the wilderness, — walk in my Statutes — and hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between me and you, &c. Who can these be, but, the people of Israel as contradistinguished from other people? the Jews as contradistinguished from the Gentiles? Yet when you tell us from hence (*Eng.* p. 26.) and particularly from *Exod.* 31. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. that 'tis called, a sign for ever between him and his people, to distinguish his people from others; you think much (*Rep.* p. 52.) that I should understand it (*Disc.* p. 60.) of the people of Israel: though, in the place by you cited (*Exod.* 31. 17.) it be expressly said, *It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel.* And therefore (whatever You mean by it) the meaning of the Text is the people of Israel. Like to that of *Exod.* 11. 7. *The Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel.*

And here I think it is not improper to take notice of that solemn Clause (which we often meet with, both as to *Circumcision*, and the *Jewish Sabbath*, as well as other Rites) namely in your generations. *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant, between me and thy seed after thee [in their generations] for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.* And ver. 9. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee [in their generations.]* And ver. 12. *He that is eight days old shall be circumcised amongst you, every male-child [in your generations.]* Where I take the words in your generations, to be (*verba minuentia*) Words of Abatement. An Everlasting Covenant, but, to whom? To the Seed of Abraham (not to all the world.) And how long? In your Generations; so long as you and they continue to be a separate generation distinguished from the rest of the World; not when that wall of Separation shall be taken away. So concerning the *Manna*, *Exod.* 16. 32. *Fill an Omer of it to be kept [for your Generations;]* and ver. 33. *Lay it up before the Lord, to be kept [for your Generations.]* And of their Sabbaths, *Exod.* 31. 13. *My Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you, [throughout your Generations.]* And v. 16, 17. *The Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath [through-*

[throughout their Generations,] for a perpetual Covenant; it is a sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever. 'Tis so, a perpetual Covenant, as yet to be confined to the Children of Israel (as Circumcision was to the Seed of Abraham,) and while they continued a separate Generation from the rest of Mankind. I speak still of the Jewish Sabbath (from the first raining of Manna,) not of what might be afterward appointed in the room of that, when that should cease.

But when you tell us (*Rep.* p. 52.) that when you say *To distinguish Gods people from others*, your meaning was and is throughout, that the Sabbath (this Saturday Sabbath) was and is a perpetual sign and Covenant with all True Israelites, that is, all the Believers of all Nations, in all Ages, from the Beginning of the Word to the End of it, to distinguish such from the Disobedient to Gods Law: Pray consider, how unkind you are to all the Christian World except your self (and some few more) whom, because they do not observe your Saturday Sabbath, you exclude from the number of Gods People, of true Israelites, of true Believers; and rank them with the disobedient to Gods laws, whom you elsewhere call (with great displeasure) the Anomists, the Ungodly, with other the like hard terms. Is this agreeable to that Candour you promised (*Eng.* p. 3, 4.) to the Advocates for the First-day? Must we All be excluded from the the number of Gods people? I should have thought, that, when you complain of *Heats*, and carrying 'it High, which (you say) you much dislike, because you are persuaded that many of both sides (whoever do mistake) do conscientiously mistake: you would have had so much charity for us, as to think some of us may yet be Gods People; and so much modesty as to think the mistake may possibly be on your side, rather than on the whole body of Christians (some very few excepted) who Religiously observe the Lords-day.

But whatever those Jews or Judaizing Christians did pretend; as if Salvation were not to be had out of the Jewish Church, (as being the whole Church of God) and therefore, the Gentiles, if they expected Salvation must first by circumcision be brought within the pale of that Church, (and consequently obnoxious to the whole Mosaic Law, *Gal.* 5. 3.) The Apostles doctrine was otherwise, that the pale was now taken away, the inclosure laid open and disparted, the wall of partition broken down, and what advantages had before been peculiar to the Jews, were now in common to Gentiles also, without becoming members of the Jewish Church. And therefore he doth

exhort them to *stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not to be intangled with the yoke of bondage to the Jewish Church, Gal. 5. 1.* What was before a *sign or mark of distinction* between Jew and Gentile, being now at an end at least as to the Gentiles, however the Jews might yet be permitted, if yet unsatisfied, to continue their former practise; without imposing it on the Gentiles, (to whom before it had not been a law:) And the same was the sense of the *Synod of Jerusalem, Act. 15.* and of *James with the brethren Act. 21. 17.*

Now I suppose you will not say, that the *Gentiles*, before this time, did observe the *Jewish Sabbath*, (so that, to them, it was a new thing,) For you tell us again and again that *they (all nations, Rep. p. 74.) worshipped the Sun upon Sunday*; their day of Worship (such as it was) was on another day.

And, though I am not of your opinion, that they did (any of them) worship the Sun upon Sunday any more than on another day, or that the name of Sunday (or of the other week-days) was then known: Yet I do believe they did not observe the *Jewish Sabbath*; because this was a *sign of a perpetual Covenant, between God and the Children of Israel*, *Exod. 31. 16, 17.* (as, in a peculiar manner, their God, in contradistinction to other Nations,) as was *Circumcision, a sign or token of such Covenant between God and the seed of Abraham, Gen. 17. 9, 11.* And though you are not willing to understand it of God and the Children of Israel (though it be expressly said so, in those very words, *between me and the Children of Israel*) but *between God and his People (from the beginning of the world to the end thereof,)* Yet when you do contend also that *this people were then the whole visible Church*; if but a distinction between God and his people, you must admit that the Gentiles (who were then not a people, 1 Pet. 2. 10. or not his people, Rom. 9. 25, 26,) did not observe it, (else how could this be a sign, or token of distinction, even between God and his people?) So that the *Jewish Sabbath* was to them, a new thing. And your self own it so to be *Rep. p. 51. That it was then New to the Heathens I agree*, be your own words.

Now, as to such new things to be introduced on the Gentiles, from the Jewish Church, we find it resolved on a solemn Argument, by the Synod at Jerusalem, *Act. 15. not to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which from the Gentiles are turned unto God, ver. 10, 19. It seemed good (say they) unto the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than those necessary things, That ye abstain from meat offered to Idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep your selves ye shall*

shall do well, ver. 28, 29. But there is nothing of the Jewish Sabbath amongst these necessary things. And to the same purpose, James and all the Elders, assembled at Jerusalem, Act. 21. 18. where they tell Paul, that many thousands of the believing Jews, who were all zealous of the Law, had been informed, that he taught all the Jews which are amongst the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, That they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the Customs, ver. 20, 21. (of which Customs, that of the Jewish Sabbath was certainly one.) And do advise him (for the removing of that prejudice; and acquitting himself from that false information) to purify himself together with four men which had a Vow on them, to shew that himself (being a Jew) did walk orderly and keep the Law, ver. 23, 24. But as touching the Gentiles which believe (say they) we have written and concluded, that they observe no such thing, save onely that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, ver. 25. Why these particular things were insisted on as necessary at that season, I list not now to dispute, because I would not suggest new matter of dispute between me and you, (which yet I think is there intimated, at Act. 15. 20, 21. compared with Gen. 9. 5. which was a precept ancients than Circumcision, and the Mosaic Law.) But here is no mention of the Jewish Sabbath, as necessary to the Gentiles, in either place: which certainly would have been, if necessary for them to observe; it being to them a new thing, out of the law of Moses, and which was before a distinctive sign or token peculiar to them, and not observed by any other. And certainly as considerable (if not more) than abstaining from things strangled, and from blood; which perhaps You do not think to be now necessary.

You'll say perhaps, that neither is there mention of the Lord's day. True: nor yet of Baptism, or the Lords Supper, nor of ordaining Elders in every Church: Because these were Christian institutions; and no part of what was there in question. For it was not doubted whether the Christian Gentiles should observe the Christian Institutions; but, whether (with them) they were bound to observe also the Mosaic Law; for that was the point then in question, Act. 15. 1, 5, 6, 24. There rose up certain of the Sect of the Pharisees, which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of Moses. And the Apostles and Elders came together to consider of This Matter, (not about the Christian Institutions.) Where, by the Law of Moses, is not meant onely, what was newly appointed by Moses, after their coming out of Egypt; but it looks back as far as Circumcision, (which

(which was older than *Moses*) and to the Law given to *Noah* concerning *Blood*; and, I suppose, the Law of *Sacrifice* (which was older than either :) For all these (so far as they were new to them) came to the *Gentiles* as from *Moses*; that is, from the *Jewish Church constituted by Moses*, and therefore is called the *Law of Moses*. And, of all that is here enjoy'd on the *Gentiles* out of this *Law Moses*, the *Jewish Sabbath* is no part.

Now this, I think, (as sometimes you speak) goes a great way in the case. You do not pretend (for ought I see) that any other nation than the *Jews* (and their *Profelytes*) did then observe the *Jewish Sabbath*: For you grant it (*Enq. p. 26. Rep. p. 52.*) to be a *distinctive mark, or sign, if not between God and the Children of Israel*, at least between *God and his People* (which people, I presume you do not take to be the *Unconverted Heathens*; and therefore not, by them, observed.) 'Tis true that the *Heathens* did know of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and of their *Circumcision* too; but they did equally despise both, (*Recutitaeque Sabbata pallent,*) not observe either. And therefore, if it were now to be newly imposed upon them, 'tis much that it should not be recommended as one of those *necessary things* which it was fit for them to observe, as well as *abstinence from Blood, and things strangled*. Which when we find it was not, I think we have reason to conclude, that though the *Jews* were permitted to continue the practice of *That*, and of *Circumcision*; yet neither one nor the other to be imposed upon the *Gentiles*; who had *Baptism* in stead of one, and the *Lords day* instead of the other; as they had the *Lords Supper* instead of their *Pass-over*; and a more excellent *Ministry* instead of the *Levitical Priesthood*. Mean while I do not speak against the *Sabbath of the fourth Commandment* (the seventh day after six days of labour, as is the *Lords day*) but the *Jewish Sabbath* (the seventh day from the first raining of *Manna*, or that of the *Jewish week*) being imposed upon the *Gentiles* together with that of the *Lords-day*.

And therefore when you say (*Rep. p. 52.*) that *I there make the Sabbath abolished*; it is your mistake. This *seventh-day Sabbath* (those were my words, *Disc. p. 60.*) for which you please to put absolutely the *Sabbath*, (as though I would have no *Sabbath* to be now observed,) *Which seventh-day Sabbath* (you own *Enq. p. 26.*) to be a sign for ever between him and his people, to distinguish his people from others (which are your own words,) that is, (say I, not as your words, but as my own,) the people of *Israel* from other nations; and, so to be a sign for ever, as *Circumcision* is an *Everlasting Covenant*. Because (in the place by you there cited, *Exod. 31. 17.*)

it is expressly said, *It is a sign between me and the Children of Israel for ever.* But if by the Children of Israel (as you now tell us) you do not understand the Children of Israel, I cannot help it. I hope 'twill be no offense to tell you, that I do; and between them and others, to be between Jews and Gentiles; and that, a Sign for ever, and a perpetual Covenant, I understand in the same sense as when Circumcision is called an Everlasting Covenant Gen. 17. 13. And what is there said of Circumcision (ver. 11.) it is a token of the Covenant between me and you, that is (ver. 9.) thou and thy seed after thee in their generations, is the same (as to the seed of Abraham) with what is here said of this seventh-day Sabbath (as to the Children of Israel) Exod. 31. 13. it is a Sign between me and you throughout your generations. And the like of the Pass-over, Exod. 12. 24. Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy Sons for ever: that is, so long as this Oeconomy or Administration should continue. Now, what was a Distinctive Mark of the People of Israel from other Nations, (as was Circumcision, the Jews Pass-over and seventh-day Sabbath,) was, I said, at an end and to cease (that is, to expire, for which words, you put abolished) when Christ had broken down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, and made both One, and abolished the Enmity (which are the Apostles words there cited from Ephes. 2. 14, 15.) but instead of abolished the Enmity, you would have it that I make the Sabbath abolished. And at the same time (while you thus pervert my words) you complain of Artifice, and Blamable, (as if yours were not so,) for telling you that, by the Children of Israel (whatever you mean) I mean the Children of Israel, that is, the Jews. Between whom, and the Gentiles, this was a Distinctive Mark: and therefore then to expire when the Distinction was to cease.

As to what you there add (Rep. p. 52.) He repeats, that the Sabbath is a Sign, yet doubts it was either not observed at all, or long before this time had been forgotten: I do not understand the Wit of this Repartee, (unless it ly in perverting my words;) Might not the seventh day in course from the first raining of Manna, be a distinctive Sign for the future, though the seventh day in course from the first Creation were either not observed at all, or long since forgotten? Like which is that Rep. p. 2. If I do not know which is the first or seventh day in course from the Creation, why should I write a Book for the Observation of a day which is impossible to be Known? Indeed if I had writ a Book for the observation of the first day in course from the Creation (as you do for the seventh-day in course from thence) it had been something: but may not we know which is

the first day of Our week, without knowing which is so in a *continual circulation of Weeks from the Creation*? This, I suppose you take to be Wit (else we should not have it so often) and I will allow it so to be; (it is *ωτεανηλια*, a *fine turn* of words to make them look as if there were somewhat of Argument in them when there is none; such as the Logicians call *Fallacies*;) Surely you cannot think there is any *Strength of Reason*, in such arguings. And again to mention no more (though you oft talk at this rate) *Rep. p. 39. If I cannot tell which is the first or seventh day of the Week (from the first Creation) this (you say) overturns all my book.* No; not *my book*, but *yours*: because you reckon from thence, I do not. I am contented with what is *the first day of our week*. Or if we cannot tell *otherwise than by tradition* (which clause you think fit constantly to leave out) which is so *from Christ's time*: This tradition serves me well enough as to this point, (because we have no other way to know it; nor have you.) Yet I must not call this Trifling. (That, you say, is a *hard word*.) I wish the Reader do not think it *Trifling* to take notice of these *Witticisms*. I shall therefore let them pass.

But when I say, I am *in this point* content with *Tradition* (having no other way to know this matter of fact) pray do not suggest the next time, as if *in every thing* I content my self with *uncertain dark speculations, and some uncertain Romish Traditions*, *Rep. p. 36. 62. As p. 59, 60.* because I am content, to take the *names of the week-days* as I find them, I am represented as *taking all as I find it, and taking all down without chewing.*

Consonant to this doctrine (of *permitting* to the Jews, of what was not to be *imposed* on the Gentiles) is that of St. Paul to the Christian Romans; (Rom. 14.) many of whom, and perhaps the greatest part of them, seem to have been *converted Jews* (who thought themselves yet obliged to the *Mosaick Law*) others of them *Converted Gentiles* (who thought themselves under no such obligation;) Particularly in two things, difference of *Meats*, and difference of *Days*; (and it seems to be the *same persons* who were *Scrupulous* as to both;) The *Jew* (who was not yet satisfied as to his Christian liberty,) made Conscience of *Eating* what by the Mosaick Law was *Unclean*; the Gentile not so, to whom that had not been a Law: *One believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs*: 'Twas a *weakness* even in the Jew, yet was *permitted*, though not to be *imposed*: *Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth.*

eth. And so of Days; *One man esteemeth one day above another,* (which I think to be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*, though I suppose you do not,) *another esteemeth every day alike.* And the reason why I think it to be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*, is because (as I have shewed before, *Disc.* p. 55, 56, 57, from *Deut.* 16. 5, 6, 11, 15, 16.) the other *Feasts* or *Festivals* (as that of the *Pass over*, of *Pentecost*, and of *Booths*,) were not to be observed *out of the holy land*, but at *the Temple onely*, and therefore of these there could be no doubt at *Rome*, because there was no occasion for them; but, of the *Jewish Sabbath* there was, even out of their land; and so, for the difference of *Clean* and *Unclean* meats. And therefore I take *those days* and *those meats*, to be the point in question. And what says St. Paul of these days? *He that regards a day, regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it:* Do you think this to be meant of *worshiping the Sun upon Sunday*? (as you would insinuate *Rep.* p. 43. 45. *if it be meant of a weekly rest*, you say, *it is directed there, not to rest upon Sunday, which was observed by the Heathens in honour of the Sun.*) Do you think that they who *worshiped the Sun upon Sunday*, did regard the day to the Lord? I think not; nor was the like *permission* to be allowed to such, as here the Apostle doth allow. He doth elsewhere forbid the *eating* of things *offered to Idols*; do you think he would allow them to *worship the Sun upon Sunday*; and not to be *censured* for so doing? It must be therefore meant of such *Observance* as was *allowable*, and of such a day for which there might be some *pretense* even to *Christians* (if *Jews*) and such as was to be observed *out of their own land*, and not confined to *Jerusalem* or the *holy land*. Which therefore I take to be meant of the *Jewish Sabbath*; which might be *Observed*, but not *Imposed*.

Which also answers All your Allegations, which you often insist on, of *Paul's* going into the *Temple*, and the *Synagogue*, on the *Sabbath-day*. For he might so as well on that, as on any other day; and he did so on *other days* and in *other places*, where he had the opportunity of a *concourse* of People; as I shewed you fully, *Disc.* p. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54. that I need not again repeat it. And 'tis so very little you have said against it, *Rep.* p. 41, 42. that I think it needs no further Answer.

Much to the same purpose is his doctrine to the *Galatians*; save that here he seems much warmer. He calls it *preaching another Gospel*, and *perverting the Gospel of Christ*, and doth *anathematize*, or pronounce them *accursed* who shall so do, *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9. and

wishesth those cut off, who trouble them, Chap. 5. 12. by endeavouring to bring the Gentiles, under the Mosaick Law. He was contented to indulge the Jews as to their own practice, (which was the case of the Jews at Rome;) but when they would not be contented therewith, but would bring it as a yoke upon the Gentiles also, he will by no means admit it. For though the Blessing of Abraham were to come upon the Gentiles, Chap. 3. 14. yet not the Sign or mark of Distinction; there being now no difference between the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision, the Jew and the Greek; which he repeats three times in this short Epistle to the Galatians, Chap. 3. 28. Chap. 5. 6. Ch. 6. 15. And that this is the main business of this Epistle (to arm them against those who would bring in Circumcision and the Mosaick Law) is so obvious that none who reads the Epistle, with attention, can doubt of it. Nor can it be thought that it was the Gentiles interest thus to introduce the Law, but the Jews and Judaizing Christians; who would constrain them to be circumcised, that they might glory in their flesh, Chap. 6. 12, 13. Where though Circumcision be mentioned as the chief Badge; yet this was to make them debtors to the whole Law, and obnoxious to it, Chap. 5. 3. And amongst those beggarly elements, whereunto they desire to be in bondage, this is reckoned as one great instance, ye observe days and months and times and years; for which he says I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain, Chap. 4. 9, 10, 11. In that to the Romans he speaks but of a day, which was there in question, (which I take to be the Jewish Sabbath, as contradistinguished from the Lords-day;) here he puts in days and weeks and months and years; not as if (in Galatia) there were occasion for those other times (out of the holy land;) but because there was the same reason of all the Mosaick times: And if this day (of which then the doubt might be) were thus to be brought upon the Gentiles, they might by the same reason bring upon them all the rest; for I testify saith he to every man who is circumcised (and thereby put under part of that Law) that he is debtour to the whole Law; and he that subjects himself to one of those days, is equally obnoxious to all those days and weeks and months and years. And if this (of the seventh day from the first raining of Manna in contradistinction to the Lords-day) were one of those, this (though not particularly named) comes under that general.

What you object to this (beside that the Jewish Sabbath is not particularly named) is, that these beggarly Rudiments or Elements of the World, is to be understood of the Heathen World, and of the Heathenish instructions, while they were Children, and particularly

of

of *Sunday*, which you tell us so often (though I do not believe it) was by the *Heathens* observed in honour of the Sun; And that to you it seems most likely, and scarce to be doubted, that one of those days blamed by Paul, and the principal one, was *Sunday*, which the *Heathens* observed, who knew not God, &c. *Rep.* p. 42, 43, 44. But pray, look again, and you will find these *Elements of the World*, were not *Heathenish* Elements, but *Jewish* Elements, under which they had been subject, but now were free; as now no longer under a School-master, as before they had been, *Gal.* 3. 24, 25. as the *Heir*, who while a Child differs nothing from a Servant, though he be Lord of all, but is under Tutors and Governours till the time appointed by his Father: Even so we, when we were children, were under the Elements of the World; but when the fullness of time was come (the time appointed by the Father) God sent his Son --- to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of Sons; (that is, as Sons now at age, and not, as in our Non-age, little differing from Servants,) *Chap.* 4. 2, 3, 4, 5. Do you think St. Paul, when a Child, was under those *Heathenish* Elements of worshipping the Sun upon *Sunday*? I thought Paul had been of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, (and these, you there tell us, were not of those who knew not God, but did service to those who by nature are not Gods;) that he had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, that according to the strictest way of their Religion he lived a Pharisee, and was, as to the law blameless. 'Twas not therefore *Heathenish* Elements and *Heathenish* days; but *Jewish* Elements, and *Jewish* days; and if this from the first raining of Manna (as contradistinguished from the *Lords-day*) were such; this comes within that number. He says indeed ver. 8. *Ye* (*Galatians*) when he knew not God, did service to them which by nature were not Gods; But is there no difference between *Ye* and *We*? 'Tis *We* (saith Paul) were in bondage under the Elements of the World; But 'tis *Ye* (not *We*) who knew not God, &c.

A third place which I alleged to this purpose (and which is commonly so alleged) is *Col.* 2. 16. *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day (or festival) or of the New-moon, or of the Sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come.* Here *Sabbath* is expressly named (which takes off your exception, that, in the other place, it is not) and in contradistinction to other Festivals, and New-moons. And this you acknowledge (*Rep.* p. 44.) seems to be at least a colourable objection, (the most colourable objection that you know.) Let us see how you can avoid it.

*The Saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse, seem (you say) to be converted Heathens, and I suppose many of them were so, but there were it seems, amongst them, some Judaizing Christians. And Paul warns them (you say) to beware lest any man spoil them through Philosophy and vain Deceit; which you take to be Platonick Heathen Philosophy; but I take it rather to be the Jewish Philosophy, or the doctrine of the Jews; because of the words that next follow, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the World, and not after Christ. Which I take to be a contradistinction of the Jewish doctrine, to the Christian doctrine; and I so think because all the particulars there mentioned (meats, drinks, Festivals, New-moons, Sabbaths, ver. 16.) were Jewish Traditions: And such are those rudiments of the world, ver. 20, 21. Touch not, tast not, handle not. And at ver. 11. the Circumcision of Christ made without hands, is put in opposition to the Jewish Circumcision (which was no part of Heathenish Worship) in room of which we have Baptism, ver. 12. and all this in pursuance of Christs blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances ver. 15. and nailing it to his Cross; meaning the Mosaick Ceremonial Law; Christ being the Body of which those were but the shadows, v. 17. In all which I see no mention of the Philosophical Heathenish world, but of the Jewish onely. And though the Heathens had also some Festivals, I do not remember that I have any where found that their Festivals were wont to be called Sabbaths. You take, the Rudiments and Elements of the World, to be the rudiments or first teaching of the Heathenish World; but 'tis plain to be meant of the Jewish World (as I shewed you but now from Gal. 4. 3.) those Rudiments or Elements under which Paul was, before the fullness of time was come; which were (not the Heathenish, but) Jewish Elements. And that you may not think it strange that the Jewish doctrine should be called the Jewish Philosophy; you may consider that the name of Philosophy was wont to be applied to the several sorts of doctrines or ways of teaching or wisdom of several sects or nations wherein they differed from one another, (as the Philosophy of Zeno, Plato, Aristotle, the Greeks, the Romans, and so the Jews or Hebrews.) And thus Clemens Alexandrinus in his *Stromata* distinguisheth the Philosophy of the Greeks, from the φιλοσοφία τῶν βαρβάρων the Philosophy of the Barbarians, meaning that of the Jews, from whose Philosophy he shews the Greeks had borrowed much of their Learning. As before I shewed you *Disc. p. 55.* So that to me it seems clear to be meant, not of any Heathen Philosophy, but the Philosophy, Wisdom, or Learning of the Jews, the Jewish*

Jewish Doctrine as contradiſtinguiſhed to that of Chriſt.

You tell us *Rep. p. 48.* that *beſide the ſeventh-day Sabbath the Jews had at leaſt three Feſtivals or Sabbaths*; The feaſt *At the Paſſ-over*, Lev. 23. 4, 5. The feaſt of Pentecoſt, *fifty days after the Paſſ-over*, ver. 15, 16. (But that's a miſtake, not *fifty days after the Paſſ-over*, but *fifty days after the Wave-offering*,) which two are indeed called *Feſtivals*, (in the place by you cited) but not *Sabbaths*: And *the ſabbath of years*, Lev. 25. 4, 9, 10. But all theſe (whether *Sabbaths* or not *Sabbaths*) are confined to the *Holy land*, Deut. 16. 5, 6, 11, 15, 16. Lev. 25. 2. wherein the *Coloſſians* were not concerned (for *Coloſſe* was far enough off from the *Holy land*) and therefore not likely that any of theſe are the *Sabbath* here meant but ſome *other Sabbath*, to which they might pretend at *Coloſſe*: And what could that be but the *Jews ſeventh-day Sabbath*?

Your former Exception (becauſe of *οὐκ ἔστιν* here *uſed in the plural number*) that *οὐκ ἔστιν* in the plural number doth never ſignify the *Sabbath-day*, but onely *οὐκ ἔστιν* in the ſingular; you now find to be a miſtake, and own that *οὐκ ἔστιν* in the plural number is ſometimes uſed for *one Sabbath-day*. But I am to inform you further that *οὐκ ἔστιν* in the plural number, is not once or twice, but moſt frequently ſo uſed by the *Septuagints* (in their Greek Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, eſpecially of the five Books of *Moſes*) whole Language the New Teſtament doth uſe to follow. You know that in divers Languages there be many words which as to the form be *Plurals*, but in ſignification *Singulars*. Thus *Nuptiæ*, though in the plural number, ſignifies but *One Marriage*, and *Nundinæ* *One Fair*, and *Athenæ* *One Athens*; ſo *Calendæ* is but *one day* (*Dies Calendarum*), and *Nonæ* is *dies nonarum*, and *Idus* is *dies iduum*: And *tertio Calendas ſeu Calendarum*, is *tertio die ante Calendas ſeu diem Calendarum*. And ſuch is *οὐκ ἔστιν* for *One Sabbath-day*, *dies Sabbatorum*. So in the Fourth Commandment *Exod. 20. 8.* *μνησθῆναι τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν*, Remember the *Sabbath-day* (*diem Sabbatorum*) to keep it holy. And ver. 10. *ἡμέρα τῇ ἑβδόμῃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέρα*, the *ſeventh day is the Sabbath* (*Sabbatha*) of the Lord thy God. And Deut. 5. 12. *ἡμέραν ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν*, keep the *Sabbath day* (*diem Sabbatorum*) to ſanctify it; and ver. 14. *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ οὐκ ἔστιν κυρίου*, but the *ſeventh day is* (*Sabbata*) the *Sabbath of the Lord thy God*. *Exod. 16. 23.* *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀύριον: ἀγία τῇ κυρίῳ αἰών*, to morrow is the *ſabbath* (*Sabbatha*) a holy reſt to the Lord, and ver. 26. *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ οὐκ ἔστιν*, on the *ſeventh day is the ſabbath* (*Sabbata*.) *Exod. 31. 13.* *τὸ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἡμέρα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐγώ*, my *Sabbath* (*Sabbata*) it is a ſign between me and

and you, and ver. 14. *οὐλαξειδὲ σαββατα ἐν ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἐν κυρίῳ υἱῶν, ye shall keep my sabbath, (σαββατω) for it is holy unto you*; in which two verses *σαββατα* in the plural agrees with *σημειον* and *τῶν* in the singular (as before it did with *ἀνδραπονο*) because, though in the plural number, it signifies but *One* day; and again ver. 15. *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σαββατω, ἀνδραπονος ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ, on the seventh day is the sabbath (Sabbata) a holy rest unto the Lord*; and ver. 16, 17. *the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath (τὰ σαββατα) it is διαθήκη αἰώνιου, a perpetual covenant; it is a sign (σημειον) between me and the children of Israel for ever*. Where, in five verses together, *Sabbata* in the plural, is coupled with a word singular. And (beside the places already mentioned) *ἡμέρα ᾧ σαββατων the day of the Sabbath* (dies Sabbatorum) and *ἡμέρα τῇ ἑβδόμῃ σαββατα on the seventh day the Sabbath* (Sabbata) and *παύειον ᾧ ἐξέββατων the morrow of the Sabbath* (Sabbatorum) and the like, comes very often; where *σαββατα* is notoriously put for *one day*, *Exod. 35. 3. Levit. 16. 31. Lev. 23. 3, 15, 38. Lev. 24. 8. Num. 15. 32. Num. 28. 9. Deut. 5. 15*. And particularly 'tis *ἡμέρα ᾧ σαββατων (the day of Sabbaths or rests) Exod. 20. 8. Exod. 35. 3. Levit. 24. 8. Num. 15. 32. Num. 28. 9. Deut. 5. 12. Deut. 5. 15. Jer. 17. 21. Jer. 17. 22. Jer. 17. 24. Jer. 17. 27. Ezek. 46. 1. Ezek. 46. 5. Ezek. 46. 12*. and, in the New Testament *Act. 13. 14*. (and in how many more places I do not at present remember,) where 'tis manifest that *the day of the Sabbaths (σαββατων)* is *one* day. And if these be not enough, I can easily furnish you with more. For in all the five Books of Moses, we shall hardly meet with *σαββατω* in the singular number, but *σαββατα* in the plural. I shall not deny but that it may be found in some other Books of the Old Testament, (for I do not take them to be all translated by the same hand, or in the same stile.) But 'tis manifest, from the places alledged, that *σαββατα* in the plural number is wont to be used as a *Proper name* for *one Sabbath-day*. In *Kings* and *Chronicles*, *σαββατω* is sometimes used, and in *Nehemiah* pretty often in the singular number; but very seldom any where else. But whether it be *σαββατω* or *σαββατα*, in the Translation; it answers to the Hebrew *Sabbath* in the singular number; unless (very rarely) where in the Hebrew is *Sabbethoth* speaking of more *Sabbath-days* than one. And like as *ἑενοῖς* and *ἑενοῖ* do indifferently signify *Heaven*, so *σαββατω* and *σαββατα* indifferently signify *the Sabbath-day*. And in the New Testament, (which commonly follows the Language of the Septuagints) though it be sometimes called *σαββατω*, it is very often *σαββατα*, and *ἡ ἡμέρα ᾧ σαββατων*, and so I take it to be here meant *Col. 2. 16. ἡ σαββατω* or of *the Sabbath*.

Sabbath (whether day or days be supplied, I think is much one; for the Original hath neither;) *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, &c.* *It is p̄ba ior̄m̄ & v̄p̄l̄v̄ia & ōc̄c̄ar̄, or in respect of a Festival or New-moon or Sabbath;* that is, I take it, *m̄i n̄p̄ēa & ōc̄c̄ar̄*, as we find it commonly worded, not *& n̄p̄ēa & ōc̄c̄ar̄*, which I think is no where found in Scripture.

And (as here) so in divers other places *Feast, New-moon* and *Sabbath* we find mentioned as in the same equipage, 2 Kin. 4. 23. *Wherefore wilt thou go to him to day? it is neither New-moon nor Sabbath.* 1 Chr. 23. 31. *In the Sabbaths, on the New-moon and on the set Feasts.* 2 Chr. 2. 4. *For the burnt-offerings, on the Sabbaths, and on the New-moons, and on the solemn Feasts.* 2 Chr. 31. 3. *Burnt-offerings for the Sabbaths and for the New-moons and for the set Feasts.* Nehem. 10. 33. *Burnt-offerings of the Sabbaths, and of the New-moons, for the set Feasts.* Isai. 1. 13, 14. *The New-moons and Sabbath I cannot away with, your New-moons and your appointed Feasts my soul hateth.* Ezek. 45. 17. *In the Feasts and in the New-moons and in the Sabbaths.* Ezek. 46. 3. *In the Sabbaths and in the New-moons.* Lam. 2. 6. *The Lord hath caused the solemn Feasts and Sabbaths to be forgotten.* Ezek. 46. 1. *It shall be shut the six working days, but in the Sabbath it shall be opened, and in the day of the New-moon it shall be opened.* Hol. 2. 11. *I will cause all her mirth to cease, her Feast-days, her New-moons, and her Sabbaths.* Amos 8. 5. *When will the New-moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat?* Now if in all these places, where Sabbaths are coupled with New-moons and Feasts, it be meant of the Jews *Seventh day Sabbath*, why should it not be thought to be so meant here Col. 2. 16. *of the Feast, or of the New-moon, or of the Sabbath?* I add but one place more, which Eng. p. 27. you thus cite, (as referring to Gospel-times,) *It shall come to pass that from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Jehovah, Isai. 66. 23, 24. And, with this, you say, that great Gospel-Propbet concludes his Prophecy:* which you should have cited thus, *From one New-moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, &c.* which therefore sayes no more of the Sabbath than of the New-moon. And why those words a *Feast or New-moon or Sabbath* should not be thought to signify the same in Col. 2. 16. as the same words *Feasts, New-moons and Sabbaths*, do signify in Ezek. 45. 17. 1 Chr. 23. 31. 2 Chr. 2. 4. 2 Chr. 31. 3. Nehem. 10. 33. Hos. 2. 11. (and the other places cited) I see no reason. And if the words *Feast* and *New-moon* signify the same here as there; why should not also *Sabbath* be thought here to signify as there it doth? All which is not said in derogation of the

the *Weekly Sabbath* indefinitely, but of that *Jews Weekly Sabbath* in Contradistinction to the *Lords day*. Which I am fain to mention so often (in defense of my self and others) because where you find any to mention that the *Weekly Sabbath* or *Seventh-day Sabbath* (meaning that of the *Fourth Commandment*) is not here abolished; you presently catch at it as if they spoke it of *this* Seventh-day Sabbath; (that of the *Jews* from the first raining of Manna;) whereas you know, that even those who thus speak, do constantly maintain, that the *Jews* Seventh-day Sabbath was exchanged for the *Lords-day*, which is a *Weekly Sabbath* as well as that of the *Jews*.

You have yet another Exception, whereby you hope to elude this place; (leaving no stone unturned, to baffle it if you can;) *Repl. p. 45, 47, 48.* that *σαββάτων* in the plural number is in the *New Testament* sometime understood of the Sabbath, and sometime of the Week; and to you it seems it ought rather to be here rendered *Weeks*. 'Tis well you said *σαββάτων* (not *σαββα*) for you had no pretence, as to any other Case but the Genitive. But I do not find that either here, or any where else, either in the singular or the plural number, either in the Genitive or any other Case, it signifies *week* or *weeks*. The onely pretense (that I know of) why you so think, is, because *μία σαββάτων*, is commonly rendered *the first day of the week*; as if you thought *μία* to signify *first* and *σαββάτων* *week*. (And some others, not well attending the Greek construction, are apt so to take it.) But it is a mistake (as I told you the last time, and have here again told you more than once.) For this is not a literal translation (word for word) but onely as to the sense (*phrase for phrase*) such as when *μὴ γίνετο* (*Rom. 3. 4, 6. Rom. 8. 2, 15, and elsewhere*) is translated *God forbid*; not as if *μὴ* signified *God*, and *γίνετο* *forbid*; but because in Greek *μὴ γίνετο* (*be it not*) answers to our English phrase *God forbid*; for what we Reject with some Abhorrence. So 2 Joh. 10, 11. *χάριεν μὴ λέγειν*, *Bid him not God speed*. Thus *μία σαββάτων* (that is *μία ἡμέρα μετὰ σαββάτων*) *one day after the Sabbath*, answers to our English phrase *the first day of the week*. And so Luk. 18. 12. *νενήκεις δις τῷ σαββάτῳ* (that is *μετὰ τοῦ σαββάτου*) *from the Sabbath* (or after each Sabbath) *I fast twice* (before the next Sabbath) which is the same in sense with our English phrase; *I fast twice in the week*. Not as if it were rendered word for word, but sense for sense; otherwise, if *σαββάτων* had signified *week*, it should have been *δις τοῦ σαββάτου* (that is, *δις ἐν τοῦ σαββάτου*) not *δις τῷ σαββάτῳ* as here it is. 'Tis your mistake therefore to think that either

sabbaton or *sabbaton* doth of it self signify *week* or *weeks*, here or any where else. And this I told you the last time, though you do not think fit to take notice of it, or regard it; nor do you now bring any thing to take off that Answer. And, beside these Two Instances (which are clearly solv'd by the Ellipsis of the Preposition *ἐν*) I do not know a Third, where either *sabbaton* or *sabbaton* is suspected to signify *Week*; and, no where, *Weeks*. And if *sabbaton* in the plural number always signify either *Weeks* or *Sabbaths*; it will make against, not for you; As at *Mat.* 28. 1. ἔλεγε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ τῇ ἐπὶ τῷ σάββατῳ, ὅτι ἐν ἑβδόμῃ οὖν ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ἡμεῖς πάντες ἁγιασθῶμεν. *at the end of the sabbath, when the next day after the sabbath was drawing on*, so I understand it: but if (because 'tis the plural number; which, you say, doth ordinarily signify more than one) you will have it, *when Weeks were at an end, or when Sabbaths were at an end*; your work is at an end: For if there must be no more *Weeks*, or no more *Sabbaths*, what will become of your *Seventh-day Sabbath*? But if you would have it, *when the Seventh-day Sabbaths were at an end, and the First-day Sabbath coming on*; this makes for the Doctor, not against the Doctor, as you would have it *Repl.* p. 47. I add further, if the *Sabbaths* *Col.* 2. 16. do mean the *First day* i. e. *Sunday*, (as you there suggest,) why do you tell us (*Enqu.* p. 28.) that, *in the Old and New Testament, the First day is never called Sabbath*? And in *Levit.* 23. 11, 14. both the *day of the wave-offering*, and the *day of Pentecost* (which, *Rep.* p. 46. you would have to be a *Sabbath*, though I do not find it there so called) were both of them to be on the *the morrow after the Sabbath*, which I take to be *the first day of the week*.

And yet further; If these *Ceremonial Sabbaths* of the Jews, (for you do not pretend to shew that the *Heathenish* days were ever called *Sabbaths*) be the *Sabbath* (day or days) here intended; the word *sabbaton* might have been left out, and the word *ἑορτή* would as well have served without it. For (whether *Sabbaths* or no) they are all *Festivals* *ἑορταί*, and so called (*Festivals of the Lord*) *Levit.* 23. 2, 4, 6, 11, 15, 24, 27, 34, 37, 39, 41, 44. And these are *Festivals* (*ἑορταί*) in contradistinction to the *Sabbath*, *καὶ τὸ σάββατον*, beside the *the Sabbath of the Lord*, ver. 37, 38. For though the *Sabbath* also be a *Feast*, ver. 2, 3. yet it is somewhat more than those other *Festivals*, and therefore (in the place before us, *Col.* 2. 16.) 'tis mentioned by name, as distinct from the rest. *Let no man judge you in regard* (*ἑορτῆς ἢ ἑορταῖς ἢ σάββατον*) *of a Festival, or New-moon, or Sabbath*. Whereof the *Festival* returned once a Year; the *New-moon*, once a Month; the *Sabbath* once a Week. Which therefore I take to be the *Jewish Sabbath* as contradistinguished to the *Lords day*;

For 'tis of the Jewish Institutions, (not the Christian Institutions) that he is here speaking: not of the *Lords day*, nor of the *Lords Supper*; though these be *Christian Feasts*, as were the *Jewish Sabbath* and *Passover Feasts* of the Jews. Which *Christian Festivals*, exclude those of the Jews, as *Baptism* excludes *Circumcision*, ver. 11, 12. Yet not so but that they were then *Permitted* to the *Jews* (though *not obliging*) but not to be *Imposed* upon the *Gentiles*.

Beside these places alleged, wherein is mention of *Days, Feasts, Sabbaths, &c.* The same exemption from these I take to be implied in all those other places, which lay Jews and Gentiles in common. *Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles also*, Rom. 3. 29. *There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: For the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him*, Rom. 10. 12. *Are we better than they? No, in no wise*, Rom. 3. 9. *Cometh this blessedness upon the Circumcision only? or upon the Uncircumcision also? Yes, upon them also*; ver. 29. *For Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness; not when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; that he might be the Father of all that believe; though they be not circumcised*, Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11. *Circumcision is nothing, and Uncircumcision is nothing*, 1 Cor. 7. 19. So Gal. 3. 28. Gal. 5. 6. Gal. 6. 15. and to the same purpose elsewhere. In which places, and others to the like purpose, though *Circumcision* be mentioned as the distinctive Character, yet it is intended as a comprehensive Word of the whole *Mosaick Law* so far as it was peculiar to the Jews, as appears *Act. 15. 1. Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses; And ver. 5. needful to circumcise them, and command them to keep the law of Moses. And ver. 24. must be circumcised and keep the Law. And Gal. 5. 3. he that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law: And Chap. 6. 13. the Apostle complains of it, as incongruous, to press Circumcision, without an obligation to the whole Law; (for neither they who are circumcised keep the Law;) intimating a like obligation to both, and a like exemption from both. And therefore exhorts them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and (after such freedom) not to be again intangled with the yoke of bondage, Chap. 5. 1. And, in like manner, those at Jerusalem, *Act. 15. (since that God say they, hath put no difference between us and them)* conclude not to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, but only those necessary things (of which the Jewish Sabbath is none,) ver. 9, 10, 19, 20, 28, 29. And again *Act. 21. 20, 21, 24, 25. So that what was before peculiar to the Jews is declared to be not obliging to the**

the Gentiles ; of which number I take this to be one, of determining *their Sabbath*, to the *Seventh day from the first raising of Manna*. And, consequently, we are not obliged (together with the *Lords-day*) to observe the *Jewish Sabbath*.

I have now dispatch'd (and I think sufficiently) both parts of what I undertook : To justify our observation of the *Lords Day* ; And that we are not obliged to the *Jewish Sabbath*. I shall now endeavour to satisfy you (if it may be) in what you most insist upon, for the continuance of the *Jewish Sabbath*, whether *with* or *without* the *Lords day*.

What you endeavour to maintain, is this ; That from the beginning of the *World*, as ancient as the *Creation* (Rep. p. 8.) before the entrance of sin and the fall of man (Enq. p. 23. 75. Rep. p. 50.) our Lord Jesus Christ, our Mediator and Redeemer (Enq. p. 13, 64, 75, 77, 85, 86, 126, 137.) did observe, institute, bless and sanctify the seventh day (Enq. p. 23, 64.) and that this doth include the seventh day of every week afterwards in a continual succession or circulation of days and weeks (Enq. p. 27, 30, 35. Rep. p. 6, 7.) and no other weekly day (Enq. p. 23.) then or since consecrated or observed as holy, but the seventh day only (Rep. p. 7, 8.) and not only *A seventh day*, but *The seventh day* (in a continued course from the first creation) and no other day of the week, (Enq. p. 3, 46, 75.) so long as the *World* lasts (Enq. p. 23. Rep. p. 5, 7.) to Gentiles, as well as Jews (Enq. p. 23, 24, 25.) and this to begin always at *Sun-set* (Enq. p. 83; Rep. p. 68.) and that this was thenceforth observed continually, (Enq. p. 23, 24, 28.) even to this day (Enq. p. 39, 73.) and the memory thereof, that we may not be at a loss to know which is the day, transmitted continually from Father to Son (Rep. p. 10.) and this tradition never interrupted or forgotten, (Enq. p. 39.) either before or since our Saviours time, Enq. p. 39, 78, 93. Rep. p. 2, 3, 53.

But certainly there is much of this that we have no Word for ; no *Express Command* recorded. 'Tis but your conjectures or obscure inferences which you build upon ; while nothing will serve you in our case, but an *express command* recorded in the word. Enq. p. 4, 33, 42, 44, 48, 50. As I have already shew'd in most of the particulars. And shall again instance in some of them.

When you tell us, the *Seventh-day Sabbath* is as ancient as the creation, (Rep. p. 8.) I suppose you will abate the first Six days, for there is no pretense of a Sabbath before the *Seventh*. And I suppose you will allow a precedence to the *Institution of Marriage* ; for though in order of the Story, the creation of *Eve*, and giving her

in marriage to Adam, Gen. 2. be mentioned after that of Gods resting on the seventh day, yet in order of Time it was before it: For 'tis sure that on the Sixth day, God had created Man, male and female, after his own image, Gen. 1. 27. and Blessed them, saying, *Be fruitful and multiply*, ver. 28. And the like of their Eating the forbidden fruit, Gen. 3. though mentioned afterward, might be before, for ought we know. And therefore when you tell us (*Eng. p. 23, 75, and Rep. p. 50.*) that it was *before the entrance of Sin and the fall of Adam*; 'tis more than you or I know, (there is no Word for it, nor is it so Written;) And (if that were material to our business) it may be literally true, *Man being in honour continued not*, or as the words are in the Original (*Psal. 49. 12.*) *Adam in honour, (lodged not, or) continued not a night; but became like the beast that perish, (or became mortal.)* And 'tis likely enough that they might Sin the Sixth day (on which they were created;) For else (*Adam and Eve* being created, not as in an estate of *child-hood*, but as at full age; and, having received the Blessing of *Increase and multiply*) if they had so continued *one night*, I see not why *Cain* (if the first-born) might not have been *conceived in innocency* (which I hardly think, as well for other reasons, as because it is not till after they were put out of Paradise, that 'tis said, *Adam knew his Wife Eve and she conceived*, Gen. 4. 1.) And if they had (as you suppose) celebrated the first Sabbath in Innocency, I see not why he should not then have duly eaten of the tree of Life, to live for ever, Gen. 2. 9. and Chap. 3. 22. which is thought to have been a Sacrament of their Confirmation in Innocency, and freedom from Death (to which, by eating of the other Tree, they became obnoxious, Gen. 2. 17. and Chap. 3. 11, 19.) But this not being our present business, I shall not insist upon it.

I could tell you also of some Grave Divines (if that were the way of disputation between you and me to quote Authorities) who read it (Gen. 2. 2.) And on the Seventh day God Perfected the work which he had made (for so *vajickal* signifies;) understanding it of Gods promise of Christ on that day (before which promise, the condition of man after the fall, was very imperfect as to his happiness,) and by Gods Blessing that day, they understand this great Blessing promised on that day. Perhaps you may have seen a noted Treatise to that purpose of Mr. Walker a grave Minister in London above threecore years ago. And I have by me a Manuscript Treatise to the same purpose of Dr. Alting (*Jacobus Altingius*) a grave Divine and Professor at Groningen, in pursuance of Mr. Walker's notion, which he doth highly approve. But I list not to start new matter

of dispute between you and me when there is no need of it. Onely I may mind you, how slight a matter you make (*Rep. p. 11.*) of Christs solemn *Blessing* his Disciples and their Assembly (*Job. 20. 19, 21.*) a first and second time, on the day of his Resurrection being the first day, while here you would (on the Seventh day) make it an *Institution*.

I might tell you also that the other word to *Sanctify*, doth not necessarily signify to *Institute*, but to *celebrate*, or *keep holy*. 'Tis the same word in the Hebrew, for *Man's* Sanctifying the Sabbath in the Fourth Commandment, *Exod. 20. 8.* and *Deut. 5. 12.* (*Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it*) that is here used of *God*, (*he sanctified it.*) And the same word *Exod. 20.* of *Man* at ver. 8. and of *God*, ver. 11. *he blessed the Sabbath day and Sanctified it.* But sure the meaning is not, Remember to *Institute* the Sabbath day. So *Neb. 13. 22.* *to Sanctify the Sabbath day.* *Jer. 17. 22, 24, 27.* And 'twere endless to tell you how oft we are minded to *Sanctify* the Sabbath day; that is, to *Celebrate* or *Keep holy*, but not to *Institute* the Sabbath-day: So *Joel 2. 15, 16.* *Sanctify a Fast, call a Solemn Assembly, gather the People, &c.* that is, *Celebrate*, &c. Though in all these places it be the same word in the Original that is here. And if to *Bless* and *Celebrate* be here an *Institution*; why should it not be so when *Christ* did *Bless* and *Celebrate* the day of his *Resurrection*, with his *Disciples*. Mean while I am loth to extenuate or diminish the sense of the word here, but willing to allow its full force and emphasis: Onely to shew you how unkind you are to the *Lords-day* (which, with you, is worshipping the Sun upon Sunday) while you are so very *zealous* for the Jewish Sabbath, as those *Act. 21. 20.* *zealous of the law.* Yet I shall not call it, *worshipping Saturn upon Saturday.*

And when you make so great a business, and so often, with *A Seventh* and *The Seventh*; We call it *The seventh* as well as you. But the question is, *The Seventh from whence?* In *Exod. 16.* it is The Seventh in course from the first raining of *Manna*; In the Fourth Commandment, it is The Seventh after six days of labour: The *Lords-day* is The Seventh in course from the day of Christs *Resurrection*. 'Tis vain to think that where-ever we meet with *The Seventh-day* it must presently signify *The seventh* in course from the first Creation. On the Seventh day the Child died, *2 Sam. 12. 18.* Is this the Seventh from the creation? or from the raining of *Manna*? or after Six days of Labour? No. But the Seventh day of the Childs age and sickness. So the seventh day, *Judg. 14. 15, 17, 18.* is the Seventh day of *Sampsons feast*: And *Josh. 6. 4, 15.* the Seventh day

day of their compassing the Walls of Jericho. So Lev. 23. 8. *in the Seventh day is a holy Convocation, ye shall do no servile work therein.* Is this the Seventh in course from the Creation? No. But the Seventh day of the Paschal Feast; or Feast of Unleavened Bread, whatever day of the Week it happen to be. And the like in the same Chapter, Lev. 23. at ver. 24, 27, 30, 32, 35, 36, 39. where the Seventh day doth not signify the Seventh in course from the first Creation, but some other Seventh day. And when Eng. p. 26. from Ex. 24. 16. *the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days, and the Seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud,* You would have this to be on the Seventh-day Sabbath: 'Tis more than You or I know. 'Twas indeed the Seventh day after those Six on which the Cloud covered Mount Sinai, but it is not said it was the Sabbath-day, or the Seventh day of the Week, much less the Seventh in course from the first Creation; all this is but your Conjecture without Book. Now pray tell me, How I shall know that the seventh day (Exod. 16. 26; 27; 30.) *from the first raining of Manna,* is the seventh in course from the Creation, any more than that the seventh day of the Childs age is so? or the seventh day of Samsons feast? or the seventh day of encompassing Jericho? You will say perhaps, Because 'tis said Exod. 26. 13. *To morrow [is] the rest of the Holy Sabbath;* and ver. 25. *to day [is] a Sabbath to the Lord,* and ver. 26. *the seventh day [which is] the Sabbath.* But this will not serve the turn; for the word [is] is not in the Original, but supplied by the Translators: *to morrow the rest; To day a Sabbath; The seventh day, the Sabbath;* that is, is or is to be; for the Original will indifferently bear either. And ver. 29. *See, for the Lord hath Given you the Sabbath* (as if there were now newly given) therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Like as Levit. 23. 8. *in the seventh [is] an holy Convocation, ye shall do no servile work; [or is to be:]* But this is indeed a Sabbath (*no servile work to be done in it*) and so you call it (Rep. p. 48.) and though it be *The seventh day,* yet not the seventh in course from the first Creation; but the Seventh day of the Paschal feast (on whatever day of the Week.) Yet in all these places it is in the Hebrew *Hafschigini* (*The Seventh*) as well as here. So that *The seventh,* will do you no Service: Nor doth it hence appear that the Jewish Sabbath was on the Seventh in course from the first Creation.

However, (you'll say) *the seventh from the first Creation,* was the day on which God rested. And no doubt but *the seventh from the first Creation* was the seventh from the first Creation; The Seventh day of the World, was, the Seventh day of the World. The Seventh

Seventh day of *the Year*, was, the Seventh day of *the Year*; The Seventh day of *the Month*, was, the Seventh day of *the Month*; and The Seventh day of *the Week* (if they did then reckon by *Weeks*) was The Seventh day of *the Week*; But whether or no they did then reckon by *Weeks*, is the point in question. That they did then reckon by *Days*, *Months*, and *Years*, we may learn from *Gen. 1. 14.* (which are plainly distinguished by the Motions of the Sun and Moon,) But no mention of *Weeks*, there nor any where else (that I can find) earlier than *Exod. 16.* after their coming out *Egypt*. Nor do the Sun and Moon so distinguish *Weeks*, as they do *Days*, *Months* and *Years*.

But suppose we, that God did (as no doubt he did) Celebrate or Signalize (by some eminent Act or great Blessing) this Seventh day of the *Week*, of the *Month*, of the *Year*, of the *World*; as for instance, by calling Adam and Eve to account for having Eaten of the Forbidden Fruit; and thereupon pronouncing a Sentence upon the Serpent, the Woman, the Man, and the Earth; and then closing all with the Blessed Promise of the Seed of the Woman; How doth it appear from hence that it is to be our Pattern? and, if a Pattern, whether as to the seventh day of the *Week*, or of the *Month*, or of the *Year*? 'Tis not said Man did Bless, Sanctify, or Celebrate that day; or that he was commanded so to do, or did celebrate any Sabbath before that of *Exod. 16.* from the first Raining of Manna. Or if Man also might be said (so far as he was therein concerned) to celebrate (not to institute) this one day (as Moses and Israel *Exod. 15.* did that of their passing through the Red-Sea, on whatever day that was; And Noah upon his coming out of the Ark, *Gen. 8. 20, 21.* when he also received a Promise that God would no more destroy the World with a Flood, when God gave the Rain-bow as a token of this Covenant with him and with all Flesh, Chap. 9. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. And Deborah and Barak *Judg. 5.* upon the Destruction of Sisera:) It doth not, from hence, follow that this must therefore be observed weekly, to the End of the World. There was indeed in the Pass-over, an Annual memorial (not weekly) of the day on which they came out of Egypt; but not to the World's end.

You'll say perhaps Gods resting is made a Pattern in the Fourth Commandment, not of an annual but a weekly Sabbath. Very well. But that doth not appear from hence (Gen. 2.) but from *Exod. 20.* after *Exod. 16.* and from thence 'tis owned a weekly Sabbath is to be observed, that as God after the six days of Creation did rest from Creating, so they after six days of labour should on the seventh keep Sabbath; which seven days were then (I suppose) to be reckoned from the

the first raining of *Manna* *Exod.* 16. And therefore I do agree (*Disc.* p. 3.) from *Gen.* 2. and *Exod.* 20. (jointly) a weekly Sabbath is well inferred *thenceforth*; but not from *Gen.* 2. (singly,) as you seem willing sometime to mis-take me. And therefore, whatever *Intimation* may be supposed from hence, here is no express command recorded (such as you demand for the Lords day,) it is not expressly said (as I then told you) that *All mankind must, for ever after, observe every seventh day, in every week of days, reckoned continually from the first Creation.* (these were my words *Disc.* p. 4) To which your answer is (*Repl.* p. 6.) *The seventh day blessed and sanctified* *Gen.* 2. 2, 3; doth include the seventh day of every week afterwards in a continual succession or circulation of days and weeks. But how doth this from hence appear? unless we must take your word for it; (as *Enq.* p. 55.)

But then, why must this *Every where, begin just at Sun-set,* (for which you are so very positive)? Here is no such *Word* that I find, nor any mention of *Evening and Morning,* or of *darkness and light* on the *Seventh day.* I do not doubt but there was (as on other days) *light and darkness, morning and evening,* on this day also: But here's no notice taken of it, nor any *Emphasis* put upon it. You say, *This day was to begin as did the first day and all the rest,* (because you say so,) that is, you say, at *Sun-set.* But where is it written (and where should I read it) that the *First day* did begin at *Sun-set*? The *First day* did begin at the same moment as to all the world; and why then should not the *seventh*? but 'tis not *Sun-set* at the same moment, all the world over. You tell us (*Repl.* p. 67.) *You know no place in the Word where it is said that every sabbath afterward was to begin the same moment of time that the first sabbath began in Paradise.* (I suppose, you meant *sense,* when you so speak, though it be ill expressed.) I answer, *Nor do I know any place in the Word where it is said, that every sabbath afterward was to begin at Sun-set.* You tell us, there also, on what part of the fourth day the *Sun* was created is not certainly revealed that you know, nor do I, (I add also, nor in what *Meridian,* whether that of *Paradise,* or some other,) and I have told you likewise, *Neither do we know at what time of the first day God said, Let there be light;* and therefore we do not know, how long it had been dark before the *Morning* began. And I now tell you further, We do not know on what part of the seventh day, *God blessed and sanctified it.* If you say, *God sanctified it by his Example* all the day: then you resolve this *sanctification* into *example,* (not a *Command*;) If you think it signifies some positive *Command*; at what time of the day was that? You'll say, *He Rested all the day;* and therefore, from the
Begin.

Beginning of it at Sun-set. Whether it began at Sun-set or no, is the point in question. That he *Rested all the day*, I can allow you; but so he did on the *Eighth, Ninth and Tenth* day: That is, he rested from *Creating*, having finished *that work* on the *Sixth* day. But that day (you'll say perhaps,) is the *first* on which he did so rest, and in *some part* of that day he did further *sanctify it*. Now, that that *seventh* was the *first day* wherein he did not create, I grant you; but not the *first moment* wherein he did so rest. For that was on the *sixth day*. For the *Creation of Eve* was Gods *last work of Creation*, (at least, the last that we know of,) which was some while before the end of the sixth day, for he did, after that, *bring her to Adam*, and give her to be his wife, *instituted Marriage*, and gave them the *Nuptial Benediction*, *Be fruitful and multiply*: which was after that he *Rested from creating*, but before the end of the Sixth day. But at what hour of that Sixth day he so rested, we know not, so that we are not obliged to begin our Sabbath from the time of Gods *not-creating*, but rather of some *positive Acting*, which is not likely to have been at *Sun-set* (when *Night* and *sleep* was coming on) but rather by *Day-light* and time of *Action*. But, of this, we have said enough before. And, as to *Man's Celebration* of that day (if he did so celebrate it) by *Contemplating Gods infinite Excellency and his mighty works*, (*Rep. p. 7.*) this he did on the Sixth day. For, before the creation of *Eve*, God brought to *Adam every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and every living creature, and Adam gave Names to them*, (to each according to its nature, as is supposed,) and what he called them that was the name thereof, *Gen. 2. 19, 20.* So that his *Contemplation* thereof, began on the *sixth day*, and would have been (for ought we know) *Every days work*, had he continued in *Innocency*; for the *Six-days labour*, and the *sweat of his brow*, began not till after the fall, *Gen. 3. 17; 18, 19.* So that we are at a great loss (as to what you can shew us from this place) whether we are to keep a Sabbath, and when it is to begin.

You tell us (*Repl. p. 6.*) *From that Sabbatizing here, the seventh day is called the Sabbath, Exod. 20.* (I should have said, *From Gods Resting.*) But if it be so called *Exod. 20.* it is not so called *Gen. 2.* nor for 2500 Years after. For the first time we find the word *Sabbath*, is *Exod. 16. 23.* and then *ver. 25.* and again *ver. 26.* in all which places 'tis called a *Sabbath (shabbat)* not the *Sabbath (hashabbat)* as of a thing before known; but as a thing then given them; but when God had so given it them, it is then called (*ver. 29.*) *hashabbat (the Sabbath)*, For that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore

he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. But we do not find that he had before given them on the Sixth day the bread of two days, nor that it was before called a Sabbath, or that he had, before, given them a Sabbath.

But 'tis called (you say) the Sabbath Exod. 20. 9. and throughout the Old and New Testament, from the Hebrew root *Shabath* (he kept Sabbath.) I will not quarrel with you for telling us that it is The Sabbath at Exod. 20. 9. because it is so in our English Translation. But it is not so in the Original Hebrew, but a Sabbath; And so in the parallel place *Deut. 5. 14. the seventh day is Shabbat*; not *Hajshabbat*; Much less is it so throughout the Old and New Testament. But whether a Sabbath, or the Sabbath; it is not so called from *Shabath*, to Sabbathise, or keep Sabbath; but from *Shabath*, to Rest. And in Exod. 20. 11. where this is cited, as an inducement to the Sabbath there commanded, *In six days the Lord made heaven and earth— and Rested the seventh day*, it is not *vajishboth* (from *shabath*) but *vajanach* (from *nuach*;) which is a sufficient imitation that *vajishboth* in the other place is not to be taken in a forced sense for *sabbatizing* (as you would have it) but in its plain native signification in the same sense with *janach* for resting, ceasing, being quiet.

And if you had a mind to play the Critick (though, I doubt, your talent doth not ly that way) you might observe, that, according to the Analogy of the Hebrew Tongue, the Nouns are wont to be derived from the Verbs, and not the Verbs from the Nouns; and accordingly we are not to seek the sense of the Verb *shabath* (to rest) from the Noun Sabbath (as if derived from hence,) but, of the Noun *sabbath*, from that of the Verb *to Rest*. (and your self do here own, that the Verb *shabath* is the Root.) I do not deny, but that a Verb (in Hebrew) sometime (but rarely) may borrow (as at the rebound) a secondary signification (in some of its remoter Conjugations) from a Noun which had before been derived from it in its proper sense. But it's no way likely that *shabath*, in *Cal* (its first Conjugation) should borrow its signification from its derivative Noun *shabbat*, which never came in use (that we know of) till 2500 Years after. In this sense of Resting, Ceasing, or words equivalent, the Verb *shabath* is constantly used; *Gen. 8. 22. While the earth remaineth, seed-time, and harvest, and cold, and heat, and summer, and winter, and day, and night, shall not Cease.* Would you read it, *Shall not keep Sabbath?* *Prov. 18. 18. The lot maketh contention to Cease.* Is this to sabbatise? *Josh. 12. The manna Ceased on the morrow.* *Prov. 22. 10. Cast out the scorner, and— strife and reproach shall Cease.* *Nehem. 4. 11. Our adversaries said, They shall not know, neither*

neither see, till we come in the midst amongst them, and slay them, and cause the work to Cease. Nehem. 6. 3. *Why should the work Cease?* Hof. 1. 4. *Tet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to Cease the kingdom of the house of Israel.* Lament. 5. 14, 15. *The elders have Ceased from the gate, the young men from their music; The joy of our heart is Ceased; our dance is turned into mourning.* 2 Chron. 16. 5. *When Baasba heard it, he left off building Raamah, and let his work Cease.* Exod. 12. 15. *Ye shall put away (or cause to Cease) leaven out of your houses.* Ezek. 34. 25. *And I will cause evil beasts to Cease out of the land.* (not to keep Sabbath.) And if these places be not enough, I can furnish you with a great many more, where Sabbath doth certainly signify to rest or cease; not to Sabbathise or keep Sabbath. So that Gods Resting or Ceasing to Create, proves nothing as to the beginning of the Sabbath. For that Rest began before the end of the sixth day; and continued beyond the end of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth day, and (for ought I know) till Now. And as for the other words *Blessed and sanctified it*, we do no more know on what time of the day that was, than at what time of the day God made the Sun, or said, *Let there be light.* Nor is it at all likely that it was in the Evening, when Night and sleep were coming on. And therefore if our rule must be to begin our sanctifying the Sabbath when the Lord began it (as Repl. p. 614) we are yet to seek when that was.

Yet I am willing to think, and would be glad to see it proved, (for I am no enemy to a Weekly Sabbath,) that here might be a Sabbath appointed, to be thenceforth observed Weekly, however darkly insinuated. For I think somewhat less than an Express Command recorded may serve to intimate Gods pleasure, (though nothing less will serve you for the Lords day.) The great obstacle, is, That we have here no Command recorded, nor any mention of Mans here observing it, nor any footsteps of such Consequent Practise (or so much as the Name of Sabbath) for more than Two thousand five hundred Years after this time; and then accounted (not from the first Creation, but) from the first Raining of Manna. From whence I am apt to think that it was not to be observed, or it was not necessary for us to know it. But I find that a strong and willing fancy has your Language to Repl. p. 38. make you think you see it; But I cannot see with those Spectacles. Let's see your Proof.

First (you say Repl. p. 3.) *On the seventh day God had ended his work which he had made, and he Sabbathised on the seventh day from all his work.* Gen. 2. 2. All this I can allow, except the word Sabbathised,

for the reasons but now given. For the word there used signifies no more than to *Rest* or rather to *Cease*. If any where else such *Rest* do from other Circumstances of the place appear to be a *Sabbatical Rest*, this must be from those other Circumstances, not from the *Signification of the word*. Which signifies but barely to *Rest* (if so much) or rather to *Cease*. For so it is in all the places I cited; and in many more. And I did search with some diligence for a place where it might import a *Rest* (of *acquiescence*) but could not find it. (Perhaps you may.) I find such *acquiescence* intimated on the *sixth day*, and some before, *Gen. i. 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31. God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very Good.* But I find it not so said on the *Seventh day*, but that he *Rested*, that is *Ceased* to create. But whatever that *Rest* was, it was *God's Rest* not *Man's*.

A second Evidence (you say) *is the same repeated ver. 3. God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which he had created and made.* Here it is (by your own citation) he *Rested* from his work (not in it,) that is, he *Ceased* so to work; But all this is but *One Resting*, though it be so said in two verses. And 'tis *God's Resting*, not *Man's*.

But, at this rate, you may so husband it as to make this serve for five or six Evidences. 1. *On the seventh day God ended his work*, ver. 2. that is, he *finished* or *perfected* his work, namely by adding this *Seventh day* to his *Work* of six days. 2. *He Rested; or Sabbathised, on the seventh day.* 3. *God blessed the seventh day*, ver. 3. 4. *He sanctified it.* 5. the same repeated, *Because in it he had rested from all his work.* Yet still it is but *one Resting*, and 'tis from his work which he had made; and 'tis *God's Resting*, not *Man's*. It is not said that *Man* rested from all his work which he had made. But 'tis *Man's Sabbathising* that we are now inquiring for. If it had been said, (as in the case of the *Lords day*) *After eight days God rested again, and, with Adam and Eve.* It would have been a better proof than all that you bring.

A third Evidence, you say, *is in the case of Cain and Abel*, *Gen. 4. 3. In process of time Cain brought an offering to the Lord; and ver. 4. Abel also brought his offering.* Here is a precedent for *Sacrifice*; but what's this to a *Seventh-day Sabbath*? But here you tell us (*Eng. p. 23. Rep. p. 8.*) that *In process of time*, is, in the Hebrew *mikkatz jammin*, (you should have said, *jamim*, not *jammin*; for *jammin* signifies *Seas*, not *days*) *at the cutting off of days, or the end of days*; that is, it seems to you, at the end of the week; because after the seventh day they were to begin to reckon again. 1, 2, 3, &c. (that is, supposing them to reckon by weeks, which is the point in question.) But why not as well the end of the Month? (for then we begin to reckon again

1, 2, 3, &c. for the days of the next Month :) or, why not the Year? for then again we begin to reckon 1, 2, 3, for the days of the first Month of the next Year. And, that they did reckon by Months, and Years, we know; but not that they did then reckon by Weeks. (before that of Exod. 16. from the Raining of Manna.) Mr. Ainsworth tells you, at the end of days; that is at the end of the Year (for that days indefinitely, doth often so signify, a Year; as you may there see at large if you please;) or else (as we translate it) in process of time. Which I take to be the plain meaning of it without any further Criticism. At the end of days, or after days, that is, after some days; (and so Mark 2. 1. *ἔτι ἡμέρας*, after days, we translate after some days.) Or, after many days; for it was many years; for this story of Cain and Abel, was but a little before the Birth of Seth, Gen. 4. 25. which was when Adam was 130 years old, Gen. 5. 3. So Judg. 14. 8. (*mi-jamim*) after days, is rendered after a time (that is, some time after) Sampson returned to take her, &c. But if none can tell us of any other end of days at that time, this is a good Evidence, you say, that these Offerings were on the Seventh-day Sabbath. If that be all, I can tell you, The end of the Month, and the end of the Year, are the end of Days, as much as the end of the Week: and those we be sure of, this we are not. I doubt such Evidence would scarce be thought Good Evidence in Westminster-hall.

The fourth Evidence you tell us, Repl. p. 9. is from Gen. 5. 22. Enoch walked with God three hundred years. Well, what's this to a Seventh-day Sabbath? Is it said he kept a Sabbath three hundred years? No: But Enoch you say, was a Prophet, Jude ver. 14, 15, and prophesied of the Lords coming to execute judgment, and to convince all the ungodly. What's this to a Seventh-day Sabbath? How could Enoch, you say, convince others, if himself did not keep the Sabbath? But stay a while: The Text you cite doth not say that Enoch was to convince them, but he prophesied the Lord would come to convince them. And, of what were they to be convinced? of all their ungodly deeds and all their hard speeches against him (the Lord.) Here's nothing of a Sabbath. Could there be no ungodly deeds or hard speeches against the Lord, unless a Sabbath were then to be kept?

Another Evidence, had been (Enq. p. 23.) from Gen. 13. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. (as here you cite it Rep. p. 10.) where speaking of Abram and Lot's great number of cattel, it is said ver. 6. the land was not able to bear them that they might dwell together (*lashebeth*) for their substance was great, so that they could not (*lashebeth*) dwell together; that is, (you would have it) they could not sabbatise together. But this you are (upon second thoughts) contented to quit; because you

be now aware that *Ishbeth* is not formed from *sabbath* (to rest, or *sabbatise* as you would have it) but from *jashab*, to *Dwell*. Therefore this gives us no further trouble.

The next Evidence (which is now the fifth) is from *Gen. 26. 4, 5.* *Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws:* And therefore, you think, he kept a Sabbath. But that's the Question: whether to keep a Sabbath were then a Law. It was indeed a Law at *Exod. 16.* but this was long after Abraham's time. You say, 'tis said in *Exod. 16. 27, 28.* *How long will ye refuse to keep my commandments; and the commandment which Israel then broke, was, that some of them on the Seventh-day went out to gather Manna.* Which was a thing which God had newly forbid *ver. 23, 25, 26.* But did God forbid Abraham to gather Manna on the seventh day? You tell us (*Repl. p. 9.*) that Righteous Abel, was a person obedient to God in all things; and that Enoch walked with God; must we therefore conclude, that they were circumcised, because God was afterward angry with Moses *Exod. 4. 20.* for not circumcising the child? Yet such is your Argument: God was angry with those who would gather Manna on the seventh day (which God had then newly forbidden) therefore Abraham kept a Sabbath. As to what you say, *Repl. p. 11.* *If the law Broken by the Israelites Exod. 16. were the seventh day Sabbath,* (meaning the then Jewish Sabbath) then 'tis very likely, one of the Laws kept by Abraham, *Gen. 26.* Not so; for this (concerning Manna) was given long after Abraham's time. You might as well argue, that *If the law Broken by Moses, was that of Circumcision;* then 'tis very likely one of the Laws kept, by Righteous Abel. You say, *p. 11.* *The Dr. doth neither offer nor pretend that Abraham brake the Sabbath:* I answer, And the Lawyer doth not produce one Precedent that either He or any man else, did keep it, before that time; or that it was his Duty so to do. You should first make it evident that it was his duty, and that he knew it so to be, and that that day, before his time, was not irrecoverably Forgotten. For this you tell us that, *This being implanted in Adam, who was created in Gods image, it might be* (you should have proved that it was) *taught down along from Adam in gracious Families from Father to Son, and so to Abraham.* But, first, this being a Positive Law (not Natural) is not one of those which are presumed to be implanted in his Nature. You should next shew that this Law was given to him in Innocency, before he had (by the Fall) defaced Gods image in him. You should thirdly take notice that Tradition (from Father to Son) is what you are always inveighing against, as a thing of no Authority. You should fourthly consider that the

Law

Law of Marriage, was as old, if not older, than you can pretend that of the Sabbath to be (*Gen. 1. 27. and Gen. 5. 1, 2.*) the Purport of which was (you tell us) *They Two shall be one Flesh: not they three, four, or five:* must we thence conclude that Abraham did not go in to Hagar? The like of Jacob and many others. And do not your self tell us that Polygamy prevailed from Lamech to Malachi? even on divers eminent in the Church? You should therefore bring some better Argument, than that they were good men, to prove that they did then observe a Sabbath. The Feast of Tabernacles was a part of Gods Instituted worship; and David was a Good man, a man after Gods own heart, except in the matter of Uriah; will it thence follow, that David kept the Feast of Tabernacles? No; for we are expressly told 2. *Neb. 8. 17.* that from the days of Joshua the son of Nun, so that day, it had not been done. We must therefore have better Evidence, than that Abraham was a good man, to prove that he kept the Sabbath. For it might, possibly, not be a duty, or it might possibly have been so neglected (at some time or other) as that the precise day might be forgotten; and, if so, it was past recovery.

The sixth Evidence (which is your last) you tell us *Rep. p. 11.* is from *Exod. 5. 5.* (on which you descant for three pages) which amounts to this: When Moses and Aaron had desired Pharaoh to let Israel go three days journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord, Pharaoh replies, *Why do you hinder the people from their work? the people are many, and you make them Rest from their burdens: that is, say you, You make them keep a Sabbath; because yishbathem (you make them rest or cease) is a derivative from the word shabath (to rest, or cease) from whence the word Sabbath is also derived: which I think is very little to the purpose.* If Moses and Aaron had desired Pharaoh, to excuse them from their work one day in seven; this would have looked like an Argument that they had intended hence forth to keep a Weekly Sabbath (not, that they had done it hitherto, which is the point in question,) but whether just on such day (and no other) as should be the seventh in course continually from the first Creation, (which I doubt was not then known, nor is now,) would not even from hence appear. And that the word shabath doth not signify to keep a Sabbath, but barely to rest, or cease, is sufficiently shewed already. If you lay an Emphasis on yishbathem (in the Conjugation Hiphil, as you tell us *Repl. p. 12.*) 'tis the same Verb, in the same Conjugation, *Prov. 18. 18. The Lot maketh contentions to cease (not to keep Sabbath;)* And so in *Nebem. 4. 11.* And *Hos. 1. 4.* And *2. Cor. 16. 5.* And *Exod. 12. 15.* And *Ezek. 34. 35.* before cited. And in many other places which I forbear to cite. So that this

this doth you no service at all. And as for your *It is not hard to say*, and *It is not over-hard to imagine*, (but 'tis hard to prove) that by keeping a *Feast to the Lord*, they meant a Sabbath; this is but what you are wont to call *dark Conjectures*, we have no *Word* for it. By *three days journey in the wilderness*, you think may be meant *Mount Horeb* (it may be so) which (you say) *Geographers observe* (without hinderance) was about *three days journey*, (but then, they, their wives, children, and cattel, must make great marches to get thither in three days; for it was at least *three days journey* before they got to the Red-sea, Num. 33. 5, 6, 7.) where (at Mount Horeb) the *Law for the Sabbath* (you say) was reinforced, (and it must be supposed, that Pharaoh knew this, which they did not then know themselves; else what doth this signify as to Pharaoh's Answer?) And even this (if it were to keep a Sabbath) refers onely to what they were *afterward* to do (and we own that after the Law at Horeb or Sinai, a Sabbath was to be kept) it says nothing as to the *Time past* (which is what you were to prove) that it *had been thus kept continually* (without interruption) *from Gods ceasing to create, hitherto*, which you would prove from hence.

What you say *Rep. p. 13.* of a Sabbath observed *Exod. 16.* (from the first raining of *Manna*) before the Law at Sinai; is nothing to the present purpose. That there was a Sabbath appointed from the first raining of *Manna*, is agreed; the question is, whether it were observed before that time.

I had suggested (*Disc. p. 34.*) another proof as to this point (for I am not so averse from that of the Weekly Sabbath being observed in that Interval, but that I would be glad to see it well proved) from *Pharaohs seven fat kine and seven lean ones*, and the *seven full ears and seven empty*; from the *clean Beasts and Fowls* coming into the Ark by *Sevens*, Gen. 7. 2, 3. Gen. 8. 20. and from three distinct Intervals of *Seven days* distinctly noted; Gen. 7. 4, and 8. 10, 12. within the compass of one Year. Which I thought to be a better Argument (as to this matter of fact) than any you bring. To which your Reply is (*Repl. p. 35.*) *You hope I will not oblige you, or any other, to believe I so think.* (A very obliging Complement!) But I do think so, what ever you will be obliged to believe. For the frequent use of the number *Seven* in Scripture, doth (to me) represent that Number as more than ordinarily considerable; and those three distinct Intervals, of *Seven days each*, particularly noted within the compass of one Year, is that which (to me) seems the greatest Intimation of any which I meet with, of days then wont to be reckoned by *Sevens*; and though I do not take it to be a conclusive Argument, yet

yet is the best I meet with, for measuring their time by *weeks*. And I would not have you think the worse of it, for my suggesting it. As to that Expression of *Nebuchadnezzar's being seven years at grass*; 'tis a rough Expression (I was about to say rude) but 'tis your Expression, not mine; I gave you the words of Scripture, *Dan. 4. 25, 32, 33. Nebuchadnezzar's being seven years turned out to the beasts of the field*. But this Evidence is by you discarded, as none of yours; and therefore I press it no further.

Let us then *sum up the Evidence* as you lay it. The point in issue, is, Whether, after God's *Ceasing from the work of Creation* Gen. 2. 2, 3, before the *appointing a Sabbath*, upon the *Raining of Manna*, *Exod. 16.* they did, during that whole interval, all the while divide their time by *Weeks*, and on every *seventh day* of such *Weeks* (reckoned continually from that day of God's *Ceasing to create*) keep a *Weekly Sabbath*, and that the *Sabbath afterward* from the *first raining of Manna*, and that of the *Fourth Commandment*, was but a *Continuation* of that Sabbath, on such *Seventh day* in course from the *first Creation*, and no other. For which your Evidence is, That *In process of time*, or (as you will have it) *at the end of days*, that is (as I understand it) *after some days*, or *many days* (about 130 Years) *Cain and Abel brought their offerings*; which you take to be at the end, not of some *Year*, or *Month*, but at the end of some *week* (because this best suits your purpose) not of the *next week* (for *Cain and Abel* were not then born) but of *some week* about 130 years after. That *Enoch* (about 500 years after this) *walked with God*, and *promised of the Lords coming to judgment*, to convince all *ungodly men of all their ungodly deeds and hard words against the Lord*; and may be supposed (if such Sabbath were then a *duty*, and the *day known*) to have kept a *Sabbath*. That (about 12 or 13 hundred years after this) *Abraham* (a very good man) is said to have *kept all Gods Commandments* (notwithstanding that of *Polygamy* with *Hagar*) and therefore, 'tis hoped, (if such Sabbath were a *duty* and the *day known* to him,) might keep such *Weekly Sabbath*, on that day. And (about 430 years after this) when *Moses and Aaron* desired *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* go *three days journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord*; he says to them, *You hinder their work, and make them cease from their burdens*; and therefore you think they did then, and ever before that time, keep such *Weekly Sabbath*, and just upon that *Seventh day* in course from the *first Creation*. And I must leave it to the *Jury*, whether they will find all that upon this Evidence.

Now on the other hand (though I would be content it were so)

yet it seems to me somewhat strange; if it were so constantly observed, and just upon that day and no other, that we neither find any *Command* for so doing *Gen. 2.* nor so much as the name of *Sabbath* there mentioned, nor any where else for more than 2500 years, nor any mention (in the whole history of that time) of any that kept it, nor of any blamed for not keeping it (which after that time was very frequent,) and that in all those long Discourses in the Book of *Job*, none of his Friends (amongst the many faults they charge him with) should ever think of charging him with a neglect of the *Sabbath* day: And that he, when he was so jealous of his Sons *Cursing God in their heart* in the midst of their Feasting, as that he did every day offer sacrifice on their behalf, should never blame them for such Feasting for *Seven days together*, without any Sabbath (for ought appears) intervening; nor take notice of the disaster that befel them as a hand of God upon them for such neglect of the Sabbath; nor any of his Friends suggest any such consideration: Which makes me doubtful, that *such Sabbath* had not been observed during that Interval, or had long before this time been neglected and the day forgotten.

But after *Israel* came out of *Egypt* it is agreed, that *God* gave them a Sabbath, (whether then new, or then renewed, I list not to dispute.) And, that *then* it was the *seventh day* in course from the first raining of *Manna*, I think is agreed also. Whether this from the first raining of *Manna*, be also the *seventh* in course from the first Creation, neither You nor I know, nor any Man else. We may think it is, or we think it is not, but we cannot know it: We have no Word for it; and you bring nothing to prove it but *dark Conjectures*. The word *Sanctify* doth not necessarily signify to *Institute*, but to *Celebrate*, and, in the Fourth Commandment, the same word (*Kiddesh*) and in the same Conjugation, is indifferently applied to *God* and to *Man* (*Exod. 20. 8, 11.*) but *Man* did not *Institute*. That *God* did *Bless* and *Sanctify*, that is, by some blessed *Act* he did specially signalize that *seventh day* (the first day on which he did not create,) is very clear; And so he did the first day of *Christ's Resurrection*; declaring mightily our Lord *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of *God* by the Resurrection from the dead, *Rom. 1. 4.* which day *Christ* did *Celebrate*, with his Disciples, *more than Once*, (and they often afterward;) which yet you will not allow to be an *Institution*. And what you urge, that (at *Exod. 16.*) we have no Word that the day was changed, you please your self with putting Two Questions into One (as oft you do) and then putting the Proof on the wrong side; That it was *then* on the *Seventh* day from the first raining of *Manna* you cannot deny; but

but whether so from the first Creation 'tis You are to prove. The Point is clear on Our side, the Doubt is on Yours. 'Tis you are to bring a *Word* to prove, that a day was before observed, and that it was the same.

You think it strange that I should take this (from the first raining of Manna) to be a new *Epocha* (or time to reckon from,) and not a continuation of the old. My Reason for it, is because I think that the seventh in course from the first Creation, had either not been observed at all, or had long before this time been forgotten. And I gave you this further Reason for it, because (Saturday) the day next before the Raining of Manna, seems not to have been a Sabbath (as it ought to have been if this were a continuation of a former course of Sabbaths) for, on that day, the Quails came up and covered the Camp, and they were not forbid to gather them, *Exod.* 16. 8, 13. but on (Saturday) the seventh day after, they are forbid to gather Manna, because it was the Sabbath, ver. 5, 22, 23, 25, 29. Which shews a manifest difference between those two Saturdays. And that they did actually gather the Quails that day, appears *Numb.* 11. 31, 32, where 'tis expressly said, *That they gathered Quails, all that day,* (that is, all the remainder of that day next before the raining of Manna,) and all that night, and all the next day.

That the seventh day Sabbath from the Creation, if at all observed at first, might in the space of 2500 years come to be neglected and forgotten, is not strange, if we consider that the Pass-over had so been from the days of King Solomon to Hezekiah's time; and the Feast of Tabernacles, from the days of Joshua the son of Nun, till the days of Nehemiah; and if this seventh day from the first Creation came once to be forgotten, it could not be restored again (without a Miracle) as those other Feasts might; and must therefore be thenceforth no more observed, or else from some new beginning. And that there might be such new Beginning (as from the first raining of Manna) is not strange, since we see the same as to the Beginning of the Year, *Exod.* 12. 2. *This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the Year to you.* At what Month they did before begin their Year, is not certain; but from thenceforth it was to begin at the Month *Abib* or *Nisan*. So neither is it certain on what day they did before begin their Week (if at all they had Weeks) but from thenceforth they were to begin it from the seventh day from the first raining of Manna: but, from what part of that day, it is not said. 'Tis therefore incumbent on You to prove (if you can) that (notwithstanding these presumptions) a weekly Sabbath was before observed, and just upon that day, and that it did begin just at Sunset.

Your next Step, is, That this *Seventh-day Sabbath* of the *Jews*, was (*before the entrance of Sin*) given in *Paradise*, to all *Mankind*; and by *Christ* our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*: which you have not yet proved, as we shewed before. That it was not by all *Mankind* generally *Observed* (but by the *Jews* only, in their time,) I think you do agree. For that it was to be a *Distinctive Sign* you grant; and I think it was to distinguish those of *Israel* from other *Nations* (because it is expressly said, a *Sign between Me and the Children of Israel*, *Exod. 31. 17.*) You think it is, to distinguish *Gods people* from others: But it comes much to one, for you tell us also, that *Israel in Egypt*, was the *whole visible Church*; so that *Gods people*, and the *people of the Jews*, will be much the same. And therefore, I presume, you do not think that any other *Nation*, but the *Jews* and their *Profelytes* (*Jews natural*, or *Jews naturalized*) did observe the Jewish Sabbath. How could it else be a *Distinctive mark*.

And I do not find that any other *Nation* but the *Jews*, (nor they till after their coming out of *Egypt*) did keep any Sabbath at all, or so much as measure their time by *Weeks* (of *seven days*) for many Ages after this time, nor earlier (that I know of) than the times of *Christianity*, when the *Observation of the Lords day* did introduce that of *Weeks*, where *Christianity* was received. This I told you the last time *Disc. p. 5.* to which you make no Reply, but that *Mr. Chafy*, you think, is expressly for it, *Repl. p. 16.* (but you give us no proof either of his or your own.) But if *Mr. Chafy* did think so (without any proof) are you willing (in this Dispute) to be concluded by *Mr. Chafy's Opinion*? If not, why should I? If *Mr. Chafy's Opinion*, or the *common Opinion* (as sometimes you speak) are to conclude You and Me; this Dispute (of a *Saturday-Sabbath*) will be soon determined. But if it be *Mr. Chafy's Opinion*, then it is (I suppose) *Mr. Chafy's Mistake*. But the way of Argument between us two, is, What *Word* is there for it? and where is it so written? Yet I am herein so fair with you, that if you shew me any Author (sacred or prophane) older than *Christianity*, who tells us of any *Nation* (other than the *Jews*) who did (before *Christ's* time) measure their time by *Weeks* (of *seven days*) I will admit it (so far) as a competent Proof. There may perhaps be such (and therefore I shall not be peremptory in the Negative) But I do not remember that hitherto I have met any such. And when I made out his fair Offer at that time; it is not civil still to charge us (again and again) with *Worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, without attempting to shew, that the *Heathens* (before *Christ*) did observe *weeks* at all.

I shall now tell you further, that as late as *Ovid* and *Augustus's* time,

time, their *Week* (if you will give me leave to call it a *Week*) was a *week of eight days* (not of *Seven days*) which is not to your purpose, but directly against it.

Dr. *Beverage* tells of such a *Week of Eight days* in *Augustus's* time at *Rome*; as appearing by a *Stone* there digged up, containing a *Roman Calendar*, to that purpose. And *Ovid* tells us the same in his *Fast. lib. 1. vers. 54.* very distinctly, of this amongst other cays.

Est quoq; qui Nono semper ab Orbe redit.

There is (he says) a day which doth, in a continual circulation, on the Ninth day return again; meaning their *Nundinae* or *Market day*. Which thence had its Name of *Nundinae*, quasi *Novendinae*, as *Vossius* (in his *Etymologicum*) and other *Criticks* observe. Whereas, if they had distinguished their time into *Weeks of seven days*, no doubt but their *Markets* would return on the *Eighth day* (or, as we speak, on that day se'nnight,) the same day of the next *Week*. Of which if you desire to see more, you may consult a *Large Volume* of *Commentators* on *Ovid's Works*, printed at *Frankford* in the year 1601. in their *Notes* on this Verse of *Ovid*. Where we have this *Roman Calendar* at large; and therein the *Eight days* of their *Week* are designed by the *Eight Letters* A B C D E F G H, just as, in our *Calendars*, our *Seven days* are designed by the *Seven Letters*, A B C D E F G. And so from the beginning of the *Calendar* to the end, as is in ours. Which *Calendar* is there transcribed from *Paulus Manutius*, in whose *Works* it is to be seen also, (and, I think, more than once,) and (I am told) in other *Authors* also. 'Tis plain therefore, that so late as *Augustus*, the *Romans* did not distinguish their time into *Weeks of seven days*: Nor do I know of any *People* that did so, except the *Jews*.

And this leads me to another *Fansy* of yours, of *worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*; of which you seem very fond. For we are reproached with this *Sun-worship*, or *worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*, above *fourty times*. And *Eng. p. 88.* you would have it thought to be so in *Job's* time, and the name of our *Week-days* so ancient. And tell us *Eng. p. 90.* a *Romantick Story* out of *Verstegan* (but without any proof of what he says) of our *Saxon Ancestors*: who yet were later than the beginning of *Christianity*; and therefore nothing to the purpose if his *Story* had been true. I had answered all this so fully, and shewed you the true *Original* of the *Names* of our *Week-days*, *Disc. p. 63, 64, 65, 66.* and that (for ought appears) they be later than *Christ's* time; that, if you had not been very fond of the *Fansy*, you would not again (as you do often in your *Reply*)

run Divisions upon it, without bringing any proof for it but Mr. Chafy's authority, to which you refer us *Rep.* p. 55, 56, 57. But when you can shew any Writer (Heathen or Christian) older than Christianity, who mentions any of the *Week-days* by any of those Names, (or indeed who mention any *Weeks* of Seven days, other than those of the Jews,) it will be time to think further of it. The oldest Heathen Author that I can find to mention them, is *Dio Cassius*, who lived about 230 years after Christ's time; who tells us it was then a *New thing, unknown to the Ancient Greeks*. You ought therefore to have shewed, if you could, that some Author, older than Christianity, had somewhere used some of those Names. Which you have not done, and I believe cannot do. And therefore your whole Story of *worshiping the Sun upon Sunday*, more than upon other day of the week (if they had such weeks) or in contradistinction to other days, is I think, a *Groundless Fausy*, if not a *contumelious Reproach* on the *Christian Religion*.

I should now have done with this, but that I find my self here charged with what I can by no means admit.

You tell us *Repl.* p. 57. *The Original of those Names of Days the Dr. agrees to be from Heathenish Idols*. And p. 58. *The Names of the Days of the Week be Idolatrous, as the Dr. agrees*. And again, *If the Doctor will retain the old Idol Names without scruple, notwithstanding his own acknowledgment whence they are, you cannot help it*. And yet again, *so send of holding fast the Idol Names of Days*.

Hold! hold! not too fast. Where doth the Doctor agree that the original of those Names is *Idolatrous*? or from *Heathenish Idols*? or any thing to that purpose? Surely the Reader may think, that the Doctor had said *some such thing*, or else you would not so confidently have said it of him. I challenge you to shew, if you can, any Saying of mine to that purpose. I had said *Disc.* p. 66. that they are *Precarious* and *assigned at pleasure*, (as having no firm foundation, that I know of, in Natural Philosophy,) which is the utmost you can pretend to, as of mine: But do you think, all that is *Precarious* (in Natural Philosophy) or *Names imposed at pleasure*, to be therefore *Idolatrous*. Those who gave Names to you and Me, did *arbitrarily* give us our Names. They might have called You *John*, and Me *Thomas*, if they had so thought fit, (and then our Names would have been so, which now are otherwise.) But I hope there was nothing of *Idolatry* in the case.

You say, *The Sun and Moon, &c.* (from whence they are named) were *Heathenish Idols*. Hold there! *The Idols of the Heathen are silver and gold, the work of mens hands*, (or perhaps of meaner materials:) But the *Sun, Moon, and Stars*, are the good Creatures of
God

God, made for the benefit and use of Man. May we not Name the Sun and Moon because some *Heathens* have *worshiped* them? Sure we may. When any are so vain as to *worship* them, this doth not make them *Idols* (against the Second Commandment) but *false Gods* (against the First:) 'tis rather *Polytheism* than *Idolatry* in strictness of Speech. 'Tis true that an *Image* of the Sun or Moon (if made to be worshiped) may become an *Idol*, (and so may an *Image* of God also,) but this doth not make the *Sun* and *Moon* to be *Idols*. The Sign of the *Sun*, the *Moon*, the *Star*, the *Seven Stars*, upon a Sign-Post in *London*, (which give names to the Shop or House where they hang,) I do not take to be *Idolatrous*: And I know not why they may not as well give names to a *Day*, as to a *House*. I know no more *Idolatry* in *Sunday*, than the *Sun-Tavern*, or *Mars-hill*.

We are expressly forbid (you say *Rep.* p. 58.) to mention the Names of *Idols*. But I do not take the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars* to be *Idols*; at least not *such Idols* as we may not name. Or, if so, why do You name them? And if the names of *Idols* may not at all be named by us; How is it that you tell us of *Baal* and *Molech*? *Enq.* p. 88, 89. and how is it that we come to hear of *Baalim*, and *Asteroth*, and *Milchom*, and *Remphan*? of *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Mercury*, *Diana*, *Castor* and *Pollux*, in the sacred Writers?

I desire you to forbear hereafter (without giving it any hard word) to say *The Doctor* agrees, that the *Original* of these Names is *Idolatrous*. What you or others may think of it (who take down without chewing such a *Romantick Story*) I leave to them: But I do not agree, nor do I think it to be *Idolatrous*. And you might have known that I do not: I am sure you cannot know that I do. My words were plain, and full, (*Disc.* p. 66.) *Whether on each of these Days, they did worship those respective Planets, as so many Gods, I cannot say; nor do I think it.* I had told you very plainly (and you could hardly mistake me, except wilfully) from whence I thought these names were taken, and from whence they were not, *Disc.* p. 65, 66, 67. Not from the number of the *Heathen Gods* (as if they had been but *Seven*;) but from the number of the *Seven Planets*, (which I do not take to be *Gods*, but the good Creatures of God's) and not from a *Religious* but an *Harmonical* or *Astrological* account; and, how they came to be so called, and in this order. And, of what *Antiquity*: Not older than Christianity. And therefore you do me wrong to say the *Doctor* agrees it to be *Idolatrous*. I said onely it was *Precarious* (not *idolatrous*.) But, it seems, if I grant an *Inch*, you'll take an *Ell*. Now whether this be *Art*, *Artifice*, or *Legerdemain*, (thus to Palm upon me;) whether *Imposing upon the Reader*, *Imposing upon all the World*, to
pre-

pre-possess and prejudice the Reader, a very ill Breat, and highly blameable, or what other hard name to give it (out of your copia verborum or Academy of Complements) I shall leave it to the Reader. I am loth to call it Slander or Calumny; But I am sure it is not fair Practise.

I confess I might have spared saying so much, as that it was *Pre-carious*, if I had known what *improvement* would have been made of that word; I do usually Avoid delivering an Opinion, in cases by the by, which might suggest matter of dispute between us. But I find that, even so, I am not secure: For if I do not say what you would have me, then (as if you were drawing a Chancery-Bill) you will say it for me; and if then I do not expressly Deny it, you will take it for granted. Thus when, to that Objection, that *Christmass is of Humane Institution*, I had answered (*Disc. p. 13.*) *Be it so* (that is, If it be so, or Suppose it be so) *but the Pass-over was of Divine Institution; yet, &c.* Now because I had not told you, what I think of *Christmass*, you will tell me, (*Repl. p. 3.*) Where first you change my *Be it so*, into *So be it*, and then into *I admit it is so*: and then, *this lays aside all Holy-days of humane Institution*; as if I had said so. And the like very often. But I am not now answering a *Chancery-Bill*: and therefore I do not allow you to take my *Silence* to be *Consent*. As when (*Eng. p. 89.*) you suggest, as if a *Divine* might not wear a *Black Gown* (as well as a Barrister) without being reputed one of the (*Black-coat*) *Chenarims, whom God threatens to cut off*: I would not be thought of that Opinion, though I did let it pass without an Answer, as being nothing to the purpose of a *Saturday-Sabbath*.

But let me desire you (before we part) not as an Adversary, but as a Friend, not to be too lavish of your language in reproaching the *Lords day*; even what we take to be the *Lords-day*. It may be (for ought you know) what we call it. You know it hath been so thought by the Generality of Christians all along, and is so at this day. And though you may think your self herein Wiser than all Mankind, yet you may be mistaken: And (if so) then, Whose Day is it, and whose *Worship*, which you so oft reproach as *Worshipping the Sun upon Sunday*? 'Tis not suitable to that tenderness that you sometime profess, to venture so *daringly* upon that wherein, if you be mistaken, you be *dangerously* mistaken; and 'tis *highly blameable* (if I may use your own words) so to Venture. I can bear the reproaches you cast upon me all along, (without any just occasion for being so charged,) but I would not have you reproach the *Lords day*.

I have now done with your *Reply*, so far as I thought needful to take notice of it. Many things I have let pass, as not pertaining to
this

this business. And perhaps even somewhat of this might have been spared. If in some particulars I have expressed my sense otherwise than some others before have done, *Veniunt dabimus pretimusque vicissim*; and perhaps if some of them had before considered what now I write, they might have been of the same opinion. However, as to the main point in question, the Generality of Christians I take to be concurrent with me; and if in some particulars we differ, they have my Reasons for what I say.

I shall briefly summe up the chief points in dispute between you and me. That Christ, as God, (in union with the Father and Holy-Ghost,) did create the World, I readily grant. But not singly, (in contradiction to the Father and Holy-Ghost,) nor as our Mediator and Redeemer, (God and Man.) For it is the Man Christ Jesus, that is Mediator between God and Men: but he was not then Man. Nor was there any Occasion for a Redeemer, before the Fall of Adam: which was not till after the World was created. And I presume, when you consider of it, you do herein agree with me, whatever unwary expressions you might have let fall.

I agree also that God created the World in Six days; that is, that in every of those days he created somewhat; as is declared in Gen. i. But in what part of each day he did create each particular, we do not know; Nor, that he did employ the whole day therein. (And in this, I think, you may agree with me also.) For the Creation of Eve was (for ought we know) Gods last work of Creation; which was certainly finished before the End of the Sixth day. For, after this, she was given as a Wife to Adam, with the Institution of Marriage, and the Nuptial Benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply*, on the Sixth day.

I agree also, that there was, on the First day, *Darkness and Light*, (and so on the Second, Third, and other days,) and that Darkness was before Light. But, how long it had been dark before God said *Let there be Light* (whether just twelve hours, neither more nor less,) we cannot tell: Much less that every of these days did begin at *Sun-set* (before there was a Sun,) or what is equivalent to it, as you would have it. We have no Word for it, nor is it so Written. 'Tis but your *Fansy*, or (as in your own language) nothing but *dark conjectures* (very dark) or at most, some uncertain Jewish Traditions; later than our Saviour's time (for I think few of the Rabbins are so old;) And I do not know but that (since that time) Christians may understand the Bible as well as they. And sure we are, that both in the Old and New Testament, days are otherwise reckoned; the

Evening being accounted as belonging to the day *past*, not to the day *to come* on the morrow.

I agree also that God did on the *Seventh* day, *Rest* or *cease to Create*; that is, that the *Seventh* was the *first day* (though not the *first Moment*) in which he did *not create*.

I agree also that God did *Bless and Sanctify* the *Seventh* day; that is, that he did *Celebrate* or *Signalize* (by some *Holy* and *Blessed* Act of *Providence*) this *Seventh* day more than the *Eighth* or *Ninth* or those that follow (though in these also he *ceased from Creating*;) Perhaps by that *Blessed Promise* of the *Seed of the Woman* on this day. But, on *what part* of this day he did *begin* thus to *Bless* and *Sanctify* it, we cannot tell: Much less, that it was just at *Sun-set*. And, whatever it were, it doth not appear to have been *during the State of Innocence* (as you would have it, without alleging any thing to prove it) but might be (for ought appears) *after the Fall*. Nor is it said that *Adam and Eve* did *bleis* or *sanctify* it; or that they were *commanded* so to do; much less that they were *commanded for ever* after to *sanctify every seventh day* in *course* from hence; and *no other*, to the *end of the World*; as you would have it. Nor do there appear any footsteps in history (sacred or profane) that any such *Sabbath* was observed, or the *name* of *Sabbath* ever used, before that of *Exod. 16.* after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*: And whatever inducements we have so to think, are but *Conjectural*; we have no *Word* for it, nor is it so *Written*.

I do agree also, that after *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, a weekly *Sabbath* was appointed, to them, on the *seventh* day in *course* from the *first raining of Manna*: But whether *this* (from the first raining of *Manna*) were also a *seventh in course* from the first *Creation*; we cannot tell: Nor are we sure that *this* course of *Sabbaths*, even to the *Jews*, did continue till *Christ's* time; but might (for ought we know) be interrupted and forgotten during the *Babylonish Captivity*, and after restored by *Nehemiah*, either on the *same* or some *other* day, and so continue till *Christ's* time: Nor do you think (as sometimes you tell us) that any *other* nation but the *Jews* (and their *Profelites*) did then observe *this* or any *other* *Sabbath*; nor (I think) earlier than the times of *Christianity*. I add, Nor doth it appear that any *other* Nation (before the times of *Christianity*) did measure their time by *Weeks* (of seven days) as they did by *Months* and *Years*; or that even the *Jews* so did before that of *Exod. 16.* Much less, that the names of *Saturday*, *Sunday*, *Monday*, &c. were so much as *known* before that time; or that, even then, they were taken up upon an *Idolatrous* account (as you imagine) but only an *Astrological* account with respect to the *Seven Planets*. I

I agree also that in the *Fourth Commandment* on Mount Sinai a *weekly Sabbath* is appointed, on the *seventh day after six days of labour*: But that this must be (till the worlds end) just on the seventh in course from the first raining of *Manna* (as was that of the Jews,) or (as you would have it) the seventh in course from the first *Creation*, I do not find; but think our *Lords-day* doth as fully answer the *Words* and *Design* of the fourth Commandment as did, then, that of the Jews: and is as much specified by the *practise* and *appointment* of *Christ* and his *Apostles* and the *Christian Church*, (reckoned in course from *Christ's Resurrection*) as was that by *Moses* from the raining of *Manna*. (The fourth Commandment requires a *Day*; and the *Practise* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, directs to *Which day*.) And I think we have as clear Evidence that our *Lords-day* is that in a continual succession from the *Lords-day* in the *New Testament* (on the *first day of the Jewish Week*) as you can have that our *Saturday* is in a continual succession from the *Jewish Sabbath* on their *seventh day*; and much more than that it is so in a continued succession from the first *Creation*.

And in every of the points wherein we differ, I think I have so fully answered all your *Objections* and *Allegations*, that no indifferent Reader will doubt of it.

And therefore, upon the whole matter, I see no reason why either You or We should neglect to Celebrate the *Lords-day*, or change it for your *Saturday-Sabbath*.

I have forbore giving you *hard words* (save as the Arguments may pinch hard) unless perhaps in returning your own words upon you. Which if they were *soft words* as coming from you, I hope you will not think them *hard* from me. Or if even therein you think I have been too severe, I beg your Pardon. But desire you withal to consider, that, when you *Magisterially* affirm so many things of which you give so little proof, and ly so open and obnoxious to Exceptions all along, *Difficile est Satyram non scribere*. My design in writing is to Assert the *Truth*, and Preserve the *Peace* of the Church, in a point which I think *Material*: And am sorry that therein I have *You* my Adversary. For I have no ill Will to your Person, though I cannot approve your Opinion. But am

S I R,

Your very Humble Servant,

JOHN WALLIS.

Sept. 3. 2
1693. 5